United Nations A/C.2/66/7

General Assembly

Distr.: General
1 December 2011

Original: English

Sixty-sixth session
Second Committee
Agenda item 21
Globalization and interdependence

Note verbale dated 4 November 2011 from the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

The Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations has the honour to refer to the Fourth Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, held in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, from 8 to 11 November 2010, and hereby transmits the report of the proceedings (see annex). In accordance with General Assembly resolution 62/270, the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations hereby requests that the present note verbale and its annex be circulated as a document of the Assembly under agenda item 21.

11-61618 (E) 170112

Please recycle

Annex to the note verbale dated 4 November 2011 from the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: English, French and Spanish]

Fourth Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development
Puerto Vallarta, Mexico
8-11 November 2010

Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity — shared responsibility

Report of the proceedings

Contents

		Page
1.	Acknowledgements	3
2.	Introduction	5
3.	The preparatory process	7
4.	The civil society meeting (8-9 November)	9
5.	The Government meeting (10-11 November)	11
	5.1 Opening ceremony	11
	5.2 The common space	14
6.	The round table sessions	19
	6.1 Round table 1: partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity — shared responsibility	19
	6.2 Round table 2: human mobility and human development	25
	6.3 Round table 3: policy and institutional coherence to address the relationship between migration and development	35
	6.4 Working session on the platform for partnerships	45
	6.5 Special session on the future of the Forum	48
7.	Closing plenary — (November 11)	49
8.	Closing reflections	52
9.	Special thanks	53

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Government of Mexico takes pleasure in presenting this report on the discussions and outcomes of the Fourth Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Puerto Vallarta on 8-11 November 2010.

The Mexican Chair's theme for GFMD 2010 –*Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity - shared responsibility*– was born of the interest and need to take a fresh look at the connections between migration and development and the cooperative frameworks able to leverage those connections.

This report shows the many ways in which the Forum this year pioneered the concept of partnerships, ranging from the new Common Space debates in plenary between governments and civil society, through the new or renewed focus of the Roundtables on irregular migration, family, gender and climate change, to the working session on the *Platform for Partnerships (PfP)*, a support mechanism to facilitate partnerships on current and past GFMD outcomes and follow-up activities, and the Future of the Forum session focusing on the GFMD assessment to be undertaken by a group of governments in 2011-2013.

In addition to these important innovations, the GFMD maintained its unique interactive, outcomes-oriented Roundtable format, where teams of government and other experts prepared and discussed themes of common interest, as part of the GFMD process. We hope that the future of the GFMD will be assured by the active follow-up of the Roundtable outcomes, and further explored by the GFMD assessment team.

As always, it was only possible to organize such an important meeting with its widely diverse participants and stakeholders thanks to the enormous effort of all parties involved, both in regard to the substance and the organization. Nor could it have been realized without the generous intellectual and financial support of many governments, international organizations and individuals, both in Mexico and in the rest of the world. Mexico appreciates all the efforts put into the success of the GFMD 2010.

A special note of thanks goes to the BBVA Bancomer Foundation for the remarkable organization of the Civil Society Days, and the constructive participation of civil society in the Government debates. The Chair also acknowledges the professionalism and dedication of the members of the GFMD Taskforce, comprising colleagues from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Migration Institute, as well as the international advisers and the GFMD Support Unit.

The Mexican Chair is particularly grateful to Sir Peter Sutherland, Special Representative for Migration and Development of the Secretary General of the United Nations, for his ongoing engagement and support since the inception of the GFMD in 2007.

Last, but most importantly, the Mexican Chair-in-Office thanks all 2010 GFMD participants for their active and instructive contributions to the debate on how to minimize the negative effects of migration on development and maximize the

positive ones. This is a critical debate in which the GFMD will continue to grow and consolidate itself as a credible global process.

Amb. Julián Ventura Valero
GFMD 2010 Chair
Undersecretary for North America
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Dr. René Zenteno Quintero
GFMD 2010 Executive Director
Undersecretary for Population, Migration and
Religious Affairs, Ministry of Interior

Fourth meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development

Puerto Vallarta, Mexico

Report of the proceedings

2. INTRODUCTION

The Fourth Global Forum on Migration and Development was, by all accounts, a dynamic and productive meeting of government and civil society minds on a range of old and new themes relating to migration and development.

In Puerto Vallarta, and the preparations leading up to it, the GFMD explored new levels of government-civil society interaction. The overarching theme of *Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity — shared responsibility* guided both the government and civil society components of the meeting.

Mexico's experiences as a major country of origin, transit and destination positioned it well to host the 2010 GFMD. As part of larger regional integration processes, Mexico understands the importance of cross-border cooperation and partnerships. Protecting and empowering migrants and their families is a challenge that the Government knows it can best meet in partnership with other countries, civil society, international organizations and the migrants themselves.

A key objective of the GFMD 2010 was to examine partnerships, and how they are created, as effective mechanisms to address the causes, challenges and effects of migration for development, and of development for migration. The underpinning assumption was that partnerships among countries of origin, transit and destination and other stakeholders can facilitate more comprehensive, balanced policies and a greater willingness to share responsibility. Partnerships can be a more effective way of solving problems jointly, and reaching common understandings on issues that in other contexts may be sensitive and divisive. Non-governmental actors play a critical role in this.

Mexico sought to move the GFMD forward by renewing the debate on issues considered by some to be too complex for multilateral discussions. The Roundtables in 2010 revisited some concepts, broke with old stereotypes and cast a fresh eye on some key issues such as gender perspective and protection of vulnerable groups. Cooperation on curbing irregular forms of migration, particularly when exploitative and harmful to migrants and their families, can open new avenues of cooperation on managing regular forms of migration and protecting migrants in vulnerable situations. Observing the interaction between migration and development through the eyes of children and women can unlock new approaches to protecting and empowering migrants and their families.

By placing human development on the Roundtable agenda for 2010, the Chair set the appropriate context for continuing the discussion of issues dealt with in previous GFMD meetings, such as health, education, and gender, and particularly human rights and protection for all migrants. Climate change was another new highly topical, focus of discussion in 2010.

The Roundtables were interactive and constructive, and yielded some coherent proposals for follow-up actions, that build on earlier GFMD meetings and outcomes

and point the way to future GFMD business. Some of the outcomes have actually evolved with the GFMD, or have been catalyzed by the discussions of the GFMD. And some of the good practices will continue next year and beyond. The Roundtable sessions were gratifyingly well attended, and encouraged wide and animated exchanges from delegates.

Puerto Vallarta marked the culmination of a myriad of smaller endeavours throughout the year in preparation for the Fourth Meeting. At the centre of the preparations were the *Roundtable teams* - governments, international organizations and civil society who together formulated the issues, explored and shared solutions and good practices and prepared the debates for Puerto Vallarta. The two current *ad hoc Working Groups* undertook flanking studies and workshops to connect outcomes from previous GFMD meetings to these year's discussions and bring fresh evidence to the table.[1]

Thematic and regional meetings around the world, such as the South American Conference on Migration, the Ibero-American Conference, the UNIFEM/Mexican Government conference on gender etc. also tailored their agendas this year to the GFMD themes, clear evidence that the GFMD is having a cohering effect on the international debate on migration and development.

Puerto Vallarta also allowed a space for presentation and discussion among governments and expert agencies of a new facility being trialed by the GFMD– *the Platform for Partnerships(PfP)*, a vehicle intended to facilitate partnerships on current GFMD topics, previous GFMD outcomes and follow-up activities identified by the Working Groups or other governments and agencies. The session also discussed three projects to launch the PfP: Engaging Diaspora in Development Activities; Protecting Unaccompanied Migrant Children; and Developing Migration Profiles.

Regarding the *Future of the Forum*, following extensive discussion by the Troika, Steering Group and Friends of the Forum, GFMD 2010 has taken forward the earlier proposal for an assessment of the GFMD in 2011 and 2012. The Special Session on the Future of the Forum set the tracks for a team of member governments to commence the assessment during the 2011 GFMD process. This will look back on what the GFMD has achieved to date and forward to where it may be leading in the future. A stocktake of effectiveness and impacts in 2012 should help identify what needs to be done in order to secure the continuing viability and relevance of the GFMD.

GFMD 2010 may well be best remembered for its inventive approach to strengthening the government-civil society interaction. One big step towards a more functional partnership between governments and civil society within the GFMD process was the *Common Space*, which bridged the two components of the GFMD, and on the first Government Day heralded a new way of conducting the opening plenary debate.

This innovation was intended to strengthen and take on a new approach to the "interfaces" between the Government and Civil Society Days (CSD) of previous GFMD meetings. It also responded to repeated calls from both governments and

[1] The GFMD *ad hoc* Working Groups are: i) "Protecting and empowering migrants for development" co-chaired by Philippines and UAE; and ii) "Policy coherence, data and research" co-chaired by Morocco and Switzerland.

civil society for new forms of cooperation and collaboration in addressing migration and development. The Common Space was by all accounts dynamic and fresh and will hopefully become a recurrent feature in the GFMD process.

GFMD 2010 aimed for change, and indeed has set the stage for more flexible, imaginative approaches to cooperation and partnership, especially between government and non-state actors in migration and development. Puerto Vallarta sent a strong signal to the world that the GFMD can change (indeed is changing). As the Mexican Minister of the Interior stated during the 2010 inaugural ceremony: "*When global migration moves, it takes its culture and history with it, so we must also move and keep up with global migration*".

3. THE PREPARATORY PROCESS

The preparations for the Fourth Meeting of the GFMD were coordinated by the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs (SRE) and the National Migration Institute (INM). The Mexican Government appointed Amb. Juan Manuel Gómez Robledo, Undersecretary for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights at the SRE, as the GFMD 2010 Chair-in-Office. Mrs. Cecilia Romero Castillo, then Commissioner of INM, acted as Executive Director. On 7 October, she was succeeded by Mr. Salvador Beltrán del Río Madrid. In late October 2010, Amb. Julián Ventura Valero, Undersecretary for North America at the SRE assumed the GFMD Chairmanship.

The Mexican Chair followed the existing organizational framework of the GFMD, as laid down in the Operating Modalities agreed at the 2007 GFMD in Brussels, which established the Troika consisting of past, present and future Chairs,[2] the Steering Group (SG),[3] the Friends of the Forum (FoF) and the Support Unit (SU). The latter became fully operational in 2010 and provided essential administrative and organizational support to the Chair-in-Office.

As in past years, the Chair appointed, and was assisted by a *Taskforce* of national and international experts and advisors,[4] funded by other governments and international organizations. The Mexican Permanent Mission in Geneva, led by Amb. Juan José Gómez Camacho played an active role in the negotiations and conceptualization of a new discussion framework with Governments, civil society representatives and international organizations. Ongoing strategic advice and support was provided by Sir Peter Sutherland, UN Secretary General Special Representative for Migration and Development.

The Mexican Chair called three meetings of the Friends of the Forum and five of the Steering Group before the full GFMD meeting in Puerto Vallarta (see the GFMD website for details). The Chair provided the administrative and organizational facilities as well as the venue for the meeting in Puerto Vallarta, in close cooperation with the Government of the State of Jalisco.

---

[2] The extended Troika for the 2010 GFMD was comprised by Belgium, Philippines, Greece, Spain (replaced by Switzerland in October 2010) and Morocco (withdrew in October 2010). Sweden was included in the Troika after announcing its commitment to host in 2014.

[3] The GFMD Steering Group includes: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

[4] See Annex 1 for the names of the GFMD Taskforce members.

The Mexican Government largely provided the financial means for the preparatory process and the GFMD meeting itself (both for the Government Days and the Civil Society segment).[5] A number of governments (more than in earlier years), some international organizations and a private foundation, generously gave financial and in-kind support.[6]

The BBVA Bancomer Foundation was responsible for the organization of the Civil Society Days (CSD), which reaffirmed the importance of actively involving civil society actors in the migration and development debate. Bancomer Foundation largely relied on the knowledge provided by the International Advisory Committee (IAC) which included experts from international civil society from a broad range of sectors. Furthermore, Bancomer Foundation and the IAC kept an active communication with other civil society fora, such as the People's Global Action, that helped make this year's CSD a transparent and inclusive gathering.

Following the GFMD Troika and Steering Group agreement last year to Mexico's offer to host the 2010 Meeting of the GFMD, the Chair undertook a series of informal consultations with Mexican Government agencies and national and international think tanks, academia, and international and other expert organizations to find a possible theme and issues to guide the discussions of the fourth meeting of the GFMD. These consultations led Mexico to propose as the central theme for the meeting: *Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity — shared responsibility*. The Chair's proposals, contained in a Themes Concept Paper, were duly accepted by the Steering Group and the Friends of the Forum, and provided the Chair with thematic elements that came to be the essential components of the Mexico GFMD 2010 agenda. As in years past, the paper formed the basis of the 3 Roundtables (RT) and their 7 sessions.

The background documents and the sessions themselves were prepared by teams of governments, international organizations and individual experts,[7] under the guidance of three Roundtable Coordinators drawn from the Taskforce. This practical, interactive, outcomes-oriented Roundtable format distinguishes the GFMD from other similar international fora.

The Chair's proposal to set up a *Common Space* during the opening plenary session to strengthen the partnership between governments and civil society was approved by the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum, as was the introduction of a *Platform for Partnerships (PfP)* facility. The preparation of the Common Space and a working session on the PfP followed an open consultation process that included all stakeholders.

The special session dedicated to the *Future of the Forum* was supported by a working document submitted by the Chair to the Steering Group and Friends of the Forum. This paved the way for an assessment of the GFMD process in the years 2011-2013, to be undertaken by a team of interested governments.[8]

---

[5] The Chair's budget can be found in Annex 2 (Preliminary Draft Budget) and in Annex 3 (Final budget).

[6] See Annex 4 for the list of international contributions received in support of organizing Mexico GFMD.

[7] See Annex 5 for the RT Session Team Matrix.

[8] The GFMD assessment team is comprised of the Governments of Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Greece, India, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Arab Emirates. On October 2010, the Greek government announced its decision to not participate in the assessment team.

Throughout the 2010 preparatory process, the GFMD maintained its unique character as a voluntary, non-binding and informal consultative process, open to all member states of the United Nations. It continued to discuss possible ways to maximize the development benefits and minimize the negative effects of migration. In the process, the partnership with, and ties to, all sectors of civil society, were strengthened.

4. THE CIVIL SOCIETY MEETING (8-9 NOVEMBER)

The Civil Society Days (CSD), held before the government segment, were attended by representatives of 73 countries engaged in the cause of migrants and development. The Bancomer Foundation took on the organization of the CSD, at the invitation of the federal government, in recognition that it was one of the largest private foundations dealing with issues related to migration, through the scholarship program for integration "For those who stay behind" and the "*Situación Migración México*" magazine.

To guarantee the plurality of opinions necessary to adequately reflect the interests of the international civil society of the GFMD 2010, the Bancomer Foundation called a large meeting in order to establish the International Advisory Committee (IAC), taking into account the opinions and guidance of renowned specialists on the issues of migration and development. As basic criteria for selecting the members of the IAC, the Bancomer Foundation sought to create a regional and gender balance, and to cover different sectors of civil society. In addition, migrants and leading participants in earlier meetings of the Forum were invited, to create an appropriate balance between continuity and evolution of the 2010 CSD.

In mid-March 2010, the IAC of the CSD of the 2010 GFMD was formally constituted; it included 15 members and 6 observers, and had ties with 13 different national governments. Among the issues on which the IAC advised the Bancomer Foundation, were the following: the selection of experts to draft the Background Papers; the selection of delegates and observers; the methodology of the sessions and the formation and presentation of the Working Groups (moderators and rapporteurs); building bridges to collaborate with the People's Global Action; and the elaboration of the substance of the agenda of the CSD, to which parallel events were added, such as the Commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Convention of Migrant Workers by the Office of the High Commissioner of the UN for Human Rights.

Mr. Emilio Álvarez Icaz Longoria, former president of the Human Rights Commission of Mexico City, acted as Honorary President of the CSD. He chaired the Working Group in order to gather the conclusions of each session and include them in the Political Statement, where the substance of the results of the 2010 CSD was laid down. A summary of the Political Statement was presented during the inauguration of the Government component of the Forum in the presence of representatives from countries and international organizations.

In addition to the sessions, which took place within the framework of the main theme of the Forum: *Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity - shared responsibility*, the CSD were honoured by the participation of the President of Mexico, Mr. Felipe Calderón Hinojosa and the First Lady, Mrs. Margarita Zavala, who chaired the formal opening ceremony of the CSD. Among other personalities attending, were the Governor of the State of Jalisco,

Mr. Emilio González Márquez; the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mrs. Navanethem Pillay; and Mr. Peter Sutherland, UN Secretary General Special Representative for Migration and Development.

The methodology of the sessions consisted of discussing specific subjects in simultaneous sessions followed by debates on the initial conclusions in four groups, one for each general subject. The first day of the proceedings was mostly dedicated to these debates. On the second day, regional discussions were held, which also devoted time to a discussion of the Future of the Forum. These continued with the presentation and discussion of the conclusions of the general theme and the outline of the Political Statement. The CSD concluded with an emotional closing ceremony in which, among other things, the participants were invited to dedicate a minute of silence in honour of the migrants who died or disappeared on their way to other countries.

Other parallel events and special presentations also contributed substance to the proceedings. For example, Jorge Ramos, news director of Univision, addressed a prerecorded message to the audience with relevant information on migration in the United States. Amnesty International Mexico, with Gael García Bernal as its spokesperson, presented a series of short movies on migration on the southern border of Mexico. And Mr. Emilio Álvarez Icaza gave a keynote speech on Human Rights and Migration. The award of the Hestia Prize by the Alexander Onassis Foundation to the Mexican organization AMUCSS, photo exhibitions, press conferences and other presentations on subjects related to migration, further enhanced the Puerto Vallarta meeting.

Special mention should be made of the focus of this Fourth Meeting of the Forum on the efforts of both the Mexican Government and the Bancomer Foundation to boost the interaction and complementarity between discussions of the civil society and those of the governments. At occasions like the experts meeting held in Mexico City on 12-13 July, 2010, the proposed themes of both meetings were discussed with the intention of finding common ground and enhancing and enriching their proposals. All these, but above all, the creation of the "Common Space" held during the CSD as well as on the first Government Day, are clear examples of this close cooperation.

The Common Space constituted a further step forward and away from the "interfaces" of the earlier meetings of the Forum, where governments asked for a presentation of the CSD discussions. The objective of the 2010 GFMD was to increase the spaces for substantive discussions in both segments. During the CSD, four Roundtables were created, which exemplified best practices in collaboration between governments and civil society, which were also likely to be repeated. These were: the special prosecution of crimes against immigrants from Chiapas State, Mexico; a technological training network between Germany and Morocco; the draft law for domestic workers in New York; and SOS services for SMS messages for migrant workers in distress, in the Philippines.

All these elements have contributed to make the Civil Society Days more successful in terms of opening and facilitating a proactive dialogue.

5. THE GOVERNMENT MEETING (10-11 NOVEMBER)

Over 450 delegates representing 131 UN Member-States and 39 international organizations participated in the Government Meeting held on 10 and 11 November. The meeting opened with a brief inauguration ceremony, followed over the two days by the Common Space, seven break-out Roundtable discussions, a working session on the Platform for Partnerships, the special session on the Future of the Forum and the closing plenary session.

The discussions addressed specific issues related to the overarching GFMD theme, *Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity - shared responsibility.*

5.1 OPENING CEREMONY

The inaugural session was attended by the Minister of the Interior, Mexico, Mr. José Francisco Blake Mora; the Undersecretary for North America, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Chair of the Mexico GFMD, Amb. Julián Ventura Valero; Dr. René Zenteno Quintero, Undersecretary for Population, Migration and Religious Affairs, Ministry of Interior, Mexico; Dr. Navanethem Pillay, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Chair of the Global Migration Group; Mr. Salvador Beltrán del Río Madrid, Commissioner of the National Migration Institute (INM), Mexico,; Mr. Peter Sutherland, UN Secretary General Special Representative for Migration and Development,; H.E. Vassilis Karantonis, Greek Ambassador to Mexico,; Mr. Eduard Gnesa, Swiss Special Ambassador for International Collaboration on Migration Issues, as well as representatives of the Civil Society Days led by Mr. John Bingham and Ms. Mariana Blair Torres.

In his opening remarks, the Chair of the Mexico GFMD, Vice Minister Julián Ventura Valero, warmly welcomed delegates to Puerto Vallarta and expressed his gratitude to the State of Jalisco and the Mayor of Puerto Vallarta for their support, which helped ensure the success of the event. He acknowledged the contributions of Mr. Sutherland throughout the preparatory process.

Ambassador Julián Ventura stated that 2010 has been a complicated year for thousands of migrants who added to their vulnerable situation the effects of the economic crisis. Conscious of this situation, Mexico took the GFMD Chair with the aim of promoting a dialogue to address the challenges that migration poses for countries of origin, transit and destination. There was a *need for enhanced international cooperation and sharing of responsibility* in addressing the issues of migration and development. He urged all delegates to analyze migration comprehensively and without any political bias, and with a focus on human development. He anticipated that the Fourth Meeting of the GFMD would be a landmark event. The new Common Space, in particular, would form part of a broad dialogue between and among all parties concerned, to discuss common issues, such as how to improve the public perception of migration and strengthen public-private partnerships.

He thanked all the participants and reminded them that the GFMD is a live process. An assessment exercise would soon begin that would pave the way for long term goals. While there was much to be done, he affirmed Mexico's commitment in supporting the priorities of the international community with respect to migration and development issues.

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Dr. Navanethem Pillay, speaking in her capacity as Chair of the Global Migration Group (GMG), affirmed the solidarity of all 14 member agencies of the GMG to respond to the challenges of international migration. The GMG believes that a global approach addressing migration in an integrated and comprehensive way, and one that anchors migration policies in a system of rights and corresponding obligations established by international legal standards, will contribute to more effective and human policy decisions. To this end, the GFMD is an excellent opportunity for the GMG to work constructively with governments, civil society, social partners, national human rights institutions and other stakeholders.

She cited the fact that today 214 million people or about 3% of the world's total population are international migrants, while the number of internal migrants is estimated at 740 million. Migrants continue to contribute to economic growth and human development both in countries of origin and destination. For many, migration is a positive and empowering experience, but many others endure human rights violations, discrimination and exploitation.

The promotion and protection of human rights of all persons regardless of their migratory or any other status is a shared responsibility of all governments. But the GMG agencies are committed to working with governments and other stakeholders in order to build capacities and realize the benefits of migration for development, while safeguarding the human rights of all migrants. The GMG is currently implementing 240 million dollars' worth of multilateral projects in this area, but much more needs to be done.

On 30 September 2010, the GMG principals adopted a landmark statement speaking out in one voice for the protection of the human rights of all migrants, particularly those who are in an irregular situation. While recognizing the sovereignty of states to secure their borders and enforce their laws, the High Commissioner urged governments to respect the internationally guaranteed rights of all persons, to protect those rights against abuses and to fulfil the rights necessary for them to enjoy a life of dignity and security. Even beyond the human rights imperative, protection and human development gains could be realized by ending criminalization of irregular migrants, reducing barriers to human mobility and expanding channels for regular migration.

The High Commissioner recalled that in 2008, the GMG launched a joint publication on international migration and human rights to mark the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This year, in celebration of the 20th anniversary of the *Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and their Families*, the GMG urges states that have not yet ratified it to do so, and those that are already states parties to make the rights guaranteed therein a reality. She reminded the participants of the fundamental principle of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights - that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

Mr. John Bingham, Head of Policy of the International Catholic Migration Commission and Chair of the Civil Society Days International Advisory Committee, reported that more than 400 delegates and observers from 80 countries, representing migrants and a wide range of other civil society actors, international organizations and 33 governments, met during the Civil Society Days (CSD). Mr. Felipe Calderón

Hinojosa, President of Mexico, honoured this year's CSD with his presence and the active participation of the First Lady, Mrs. Margarita Zavala Calderon.

The CSD acknowledged that clear progress had been made on better integrating civil society in the debate with governments, thanks to the efforts of Mexico, the Organizing Committee and Bancomer Foundation. It also reiterated that while voluntary migration can contribute in important ways to development, migration is not and cannot be used as a substitute for development.

Mr. Bingham then highlighted the following points outlined in the Report of the Mexico CSD.[9]

- Human Development — Governments were urged to move migration out of the national security agenda and towards the framework of human development, which guarantees the social, economic and cultural rights of all, including migrants, and includes opportunities for human growth, access to decent work at home and abroad, health care, education, security of life and person, and full participation in political and social processes.
- Labour Migration — Civil society called upon governments to organize evidence-based discussions of temporary and circular migration, and to eliminate the degradation of fundamental rights based on forms of migration. They observed that the GFMD tends to turn a blind eye to the many pitfalls of temporary labour migration programs and overestimates their advantages.
- Redefining and Reducing Irregular Migration — Civil society deplored the growing criminalization of irregular migrants, the heavy emphasis on security, enforcement, militarization, detention, border controls and deportation. Criminalization is a serious obstacle to undocumented migrants being protected from violence and accessing essential public and support services, and justice and redress.
- Families and Gender-sensitive Policies — Civil society urged governments to develop policies regarding the family, and not only focus on the individual worker, in order to protect families left behind by migration. Also, governments need to develop objective, gender-sensitive monitoring indicators on migration policies.
- Climate Change — Civil society drew governments' attention to the absence of national and international policies, institutional systems, and rights-based normative rules to address large-scale movements of people because of climate change. They called upon developed countries to provide technical and financial resources towards mitigation and adaptation strategies to help countries of the global south address the impact of climate change.
- Regional Consultative Processes — Governments are urged to include civil society in the regional and inter-regional consultative processes, and to ensure that a human rights approach is at the forefront of these processes.
- Future of the Forum — While progress has been made, the engagement between civil society and governments is still too limited. Governments must work with civil society to ensure implementation of GFMD recommendations.

[9] See Annex 6 for the complete Report of the Civil Society Days of Mexico GFMD.

Civil society urged governments to give specific, honest and evidence-based attention to the issues of 1) the pitfalls of temporary and circular migration; 2) effective partnerships and serious measures to increase protection of migrants in transit; 3) rights-based labour migration policies; 4) reducing the necessity to migrate, and the financial and social costs of migration; and 5) greater integration of private sector actors and shared initiatives in migration and development.

Finally, the civil society looked forward to working with Switzerland in measuring and deepening the impact of the GFMD by giving a fresh look at thematic discussions, regional approaches, and formal assessment, in collaboration with all stakeholders.

Last to address the plenary was Mr. José Francisco Blake Mora, Minister of Interior, Mexico. He reiterated the importance of migration as one of the principal engines for the development of nations. The global village in which we all live is enriched by the culture, ideas, strength and energy that migrants contribute in their daily lives. Thus, he saw the need to promote a broad-base culture of migration characterized by natural flows, pluralism and strong inter-cultural dialogue across countries.

He acknowledged that Mexico has an enormous responsibility in view of its geostrategic position, where many migrants transit to go to the United States. From the start of President Calderón's administration, Mexico has put a great emphasis on migration policies to ensure respect for the human rights of migrants. Human rights have now been included in the National Development Plan for the period 2007-2012.

He gave assurances that Mexico will continue to improve the conditions of its migrants, including women and children. Mexico is also increasing its efforts to protect the rights of foreigners who enter its territory. As a concrete example, the National Migration Institute reduced the number of procedural steps from 59 to only 20 for foreigners to enter Mexico, and also set up electronic systems for migration processes in order to deliver more efficient and reliable services. Mexico came up with a new trans-national strategy against the kidnapping of migrants early this year, which will enhance national processes and allow countries concerned to exchange information, promote and facilitate the filing of claims against abduction of migrants, and improve border management and control.

In conclusion, Minister Blake Mora encouraged participants to ratify UN protocols and conventions in order to reach a consensus between and among countries. He expressed appreciation for the greater participation of civil society and international organizations in the Fourth Meeting of the GFMD. He believed they could help governments in creating the best conditions for safe, regular and orderly migration that respects and protects the human rights of migrants all around the world.

He then officially inaugurated the Fourth Meeting of the GFMD.

5.2 THE COMMON SPACE

The Common Space was a new initiative by the Mexican Chair to convert the GFMD opening plenary session into a more interactive event, engaging a large cross-section of government and civil society delegates. The two Common Space panel discussions took place before an audience of some 800 delegates comprising a mixture of governments and civil society.

Prior to the panel, the Government of Mexico explained the rationale of the Common Space from the perspective of the Chair-in-Office. The Chair drew attention to the complexities of migration debates and the intended role of the Common Space as one means to tackle this complexity. The GFMD faces the challenge of facilitating more diverse discussions and greater transparency; and opening up the discussions. However, there are different perspectives among members of the Forum on the appropriate degrees of openness, transparency and plurality in relation to civil society. Thus the goals of the Common Space were:

1. To send a message from governments to civil society that they are ready to take steps to be more inclusive and transparent vis-à-vis the complexities of migration;

2. For organized civil society to send a message to governments that it is ready to make a constructive contribution to discussions with governments.

Each panel followed a similar format, with an overarching theme, three opening questions posed by a moderator and six panelists drawn from government, civil society, and international organizations.

The theme for the first panel discussion was *Improving Public Perceptions of Migrants* and was moderated by Ambassador Sergio Marchi, Senior Fellow and Resident Scholar, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development in Geneva. The panelists were:

- Ms. Navanethem Pillay, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNOHCHR)
- Mr. Khandker Mosharraf Hossain, Minister of Labour and Manpower and Minister of Expatriates' Welfare and Overseas Employment Bangladesh Secretariat
- Mr. Dirk Jaspers, Director, Latin American and Caribbean Center for Demography (CELADE)
- Ms. Najla Chahda, Director, Caritas Lebanon Migration Center
- Mr. Eric Schwartz, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, US Department of State
- Dr. Raúl Delgado Wise, Director, Unidad Académica de Estudios del Desarrollo, Autonomous University of Zacatecas

In his opening remarks, the moderator noted that it was important to insist on getting the facts that shape perceptions of migrants right, because if the story is wrong, the future will be wrong. In relation to the theme of GFMD 2010, he stressed the importance of working in concert to get that story right. He pointed out that for sound governance of migration at all levels, politicians and policy makers needed a well-informed public in order to craft appropriate regulations and laws to oversee migration.

The moderator posed three questions to the panelists to catalyze both the panelist and general discussion: 1) How can public and private institutions together contribute to a better understanding and more balanced perception of migrants, and ensure a more balanced public debate on migration? 2) Why are public perceptions

about migration important for development? and 3) What measures can governments and their civil society partners take to reduce bad perceptions of migrants?

Panelists and participants revealed that there are real public concerns about migration. For instance, a Eurobarometer survey highlighted migration as the second-most pressing concern for Europeans after health care, but ahead of terrorism. In the United States, the effects of the economic crisis — foreclosures, job losses, etc. — were seen as creating a backdrop of anxieties vis-à-vis migration. However, it was suggested that this is not just a North-South issue, as many migrant-receiving countries in the South also face similar issues. There was general agreement that many societies have a low regard for migrants (such as domestic workers), and/or are on the receiving end of much misinformation.

A number of approaches and solutions were proffered to address the issue of negative perceptions of migrants. Panelists proposed a comprehensive and integrated analytical framework that extends the migration and development nexus to include human rights, focuses on migrants' contributions to countries of origin and destination, factors in the cost of migration to countries of origin, considers the implications of migration for migrants and their families, and addresses the root causes of migration.

It was further suggested that leadership plays a critical role in setting the tone. Specifically, leadership must channel people's fears and anxieties into values of social, political, economic, and cultural inclusion. Leadership must emphasize migrants' contributions to society (both the receiving society and the country of origin). Principled opposition to attempts to create divisions that harm migrants is also a crucial role for leadership, as is responsibility to speak frankly and transparently. Leadership must also avoid demonization of irregular migrants, most of whom are simply seeking a better life.

Leaders must emphasize the costs — in terms of the potential for exploitation and abuse of their basic human rights as well as unfair competition - of keeping irregular migrants underground. They must also demonstrate a capacity to manage the complex issues relating to migration, including enforcement. In particular, national/federal leaders have a responsibility to provide local leadership with the resources to provide services that are so essential to effective integration of migrants into local communities.

Better data, information, education, and effective communication also emerged as important parts of the solution to negative perceptions of migrants. Some panelists identified the need for a new set of indicators. Information about migrants' contributions to societies as well as migrants' success stories were felt to be important additions to the armory of data to counter misperceptions. For instance, it was stated that Mexicans in the US contribute more than USD 80 billion in healthcare and social security payments, which exceeds what the US Government spends on the Mexicans.

Education programs and campaigns to counter racism and xenophobia were highlighted. However, it was also noted that such programs may be ineffective in the face of the deeply entrenched fears of those most affected by the economic crisis. Also required, it was suggested, are deeper reforms to address these economic challenges as well as global imbalances between developed and developing countries.

The media has a crucial role to play in tackling prejudice, in public education, and in raising awareness. In the Philippines, for instance, *telenovelas* (soap operas) that integrate migrant stories into the storylines, and a media campaign in Lebanon to enlighten the public about the rights of migrant domestic workers, were highlighted as two examples of effective media usage. It was also noted that media can help to educate migrants about their rights.

The view was expressed that states should honour their international obligations, while others felt the ratification of the 1990 Convention on the protection of migrants and their families would go some way toward addressing the problem of negative perceptions of migrants. Others stressed the importance of effective integration policies and good language education, for instance, and this buttresses the earlier point about the role of national leadership ensuring that local leaders have the resources to effect sound integration.

It was noted that the divergent interests between countries of origin and destination underpinned differing perceptions and necessitated continued dialogue, such as the Common Space panel discussion.

Finally, the slogan "nothing about migrants without migrants" was offered to underline the importance of involving migrants in all efforts to improve public perceptions of migrants.

The second Common Space discussion panel, *Migration for human development — enhancing partnerships*, was moderated by Dr. René Zenteno, Undersecretary for Population, Migration and Religious Affairs, Ministry of Interior, Mexico. The six panelists were:

- Ms. Lorena Escudero, Minister, National Ministry for Migrants, Ecuador
- Mr. Stefano Manservisi, Director General for Home Affairs, European Commission
- Ms. Mebrat Beyene, Ethiopian Expatriates Affairs Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr. Colin Rajah, Coordinator of the International Migrant Rights Program at the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR), Migrant Rights International
- Ambassador William Lacy Swing, Director General, International Organization for Migration
- Mr. Emilio Álvarez Icaza Longoria, former Chair of the Human Rights Commission of Mexico City and Honorary Chair of the GFMD Civil Society Days

The panelists first deliberated around three opening questions: 1) How can public-private partnerships on migration work for human development? 2) How can public-private partnerships for development work for migration? 3) What role can the UN, other expert international organizations and civil society play in fostering partnerships to leverage the benefits of migration for human development?

Panelists and participants reflected upon the nature of migration, mankind's oldest poverty reduction strategy, as one panelist described it (another noted that everyone is a migrant from East Africa). There was a suggestion that the 21st century may

indeed be the century of migration, with important implications for the makeup of nation states. There was also a suggestion that human mobility today represents an unstoppable force. Another view was that we are witnessing a fundamentally different form of human mobility that differs from the classical mode of migration, in which the poor migrant leaves behind everything for the new beginning. Now, according to this view, a bottom up approach to deal with the "dark side of globalization" is underway, that is a more personal project. In this form of mobility, people move but do not leave behind their culture or family, and this demands new forms of integration that call for more than assimilation.

Panelists agreed on a vision of migration which is informed, free, and voluntary; and protects migrants while in transit; and that sees migrants accepted as equals upon arrival at their destination. This vision itself rests upon a notion of universal citizenship, symbolized by a universal passport developed in South America and carried by many people in solidarity with migrants (reinforcing the message that "we are all migrants").

The discussion produced insights into an approach suited to the challenges of modern-day migration. Such an approach would be migrant-centered, seeing people as migrant citizens, not just migrants; with equality as a core principle; and migrants would not be instruments but would be valued for the contributions they make to both host and origin societies. Human rights – the right to migrate; the right not to migrate (i.e. the right to development *in situ*); the right to return; and the rights of migrants regardless of their status - were also proposed as located at the heart of this approach.

The importance of addressing the structural imbalances between richer and poorer nations was stressed.

A call was made for a new form of global governance to accompany this new mobility that adequately reflects the complexity of today's migratory flows and generates a set of rules with which all actors comply. It was noted that a comprehensive approach is required – both whole of government and whole of society. At the same time, it was suggested that this approach should balance the right of the state to protect its national sovereignty with the right of the individual to migrate in search of a better life. While some stressed the importance of states adopting existing treaties on protecting migrants, a view was expressed that there is a need to review UN conventions that have only been ratified by a few states.

Different types of partnerships were identified to effect migration for human development, but it was pointed out that making the compelling case for such partnerships - which is not always self-evident - is essential. However, the challenge of dealing with a billion people on the move across the globe at any one time, with one-quarter being international migrants and the rest internal, is not one that any one party can tackle alone.

The importance of partnerships between migrant origin, transit, and destination countries was stressed. Partnerships between migrants/diasporas and their home countries/communities were also highlighted as having the potential to bring about development outcomes. The example of Ethiopia was cited in which hometown associations abroad help to build clinics, schools, libraries, etc. and the government provides the staff.

Regional partnerships were also highlighted as important, for instance the regional consultative processes, although there are gaps in Central Africa, Central Asia, and the Caribbean that states must address. Bilateral partnerships were also stressed. Some described civil society as the "canary in the coal mine" – close enough to the grassroots to pick up early on problems and address them, so that states can later pick up and scale up responses as required.

Public-private partnerships were also highlighted as having the potential to add value at every stage of the migration life cycle. When a decision is taken to move partnerships to invest in training, information provision and recruitment options are important. Moldova was cited as an example, within the context of EU Mobility Partnerships, in which in-country training, capacity-building and job fairs occur. Partnerships to enforce ethical recruitment to avoid or limit brain-drain and brain-waste problems also play a role. When someone has arrived in a given country, partnerships to reduce the cost of remittances can add value. And when the person decides to move again (often to return home), partnerships to effect a successful reintegration are important (e.g. to help the returnee establish a business venture). Local level partnerships are also important at each stage of the migration lifecycle.

Several gaps in knowledge required to facilitate evidence-based policy-making were highlighted: matching supply and demand in international labour markets; bottlenecks where investment in education is needed; and more concrete formulations for policy coherence.

Finally, it was noted that the GFMD embodied the desire of states to fashion new forms of governance to accompany this new age of human mobility. However, it was noted that the Civil Society Days could be strengthened by disseminating the conclusions of its meetings more widely. Participants expressed their desire to see continuity of the Civil Society Days into the 2011 Swiss Chairmanship and beyond.

6. THE ROUNDTABLE SESSIONS

6.1 ROUNDTABLE 1: PARTNERSHIPS FOR MIGRATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: SHARED PROSPERITY — SHARED RESPONSIBILITY

(Coordinator Dr. Jorge Durand)[10]

The subject of irregular migration, with its two different foci of discussion and analysis — partnerships for more regular and protected migration (RT 1.1) and joint strategies to address irregular migration (RT 1.2) — was a key topic at the Fourth Meeting of the GFMD. In the context of the background paper written by Mexico, the focus on human development, shared prosperity and shared responsibility was emphasized. Based on that, an open, honest and direct debate took place on irregular migration and partnerships for regular and protected migration.

The different perspectives and opinions enriched the debate about a reality that was dealt with, only in an indirect way in past GFMD meetings. Delegates from different countries put on the table a wide range of negotiations, partnerships and arrangements between countries and stakeholders in the migration process that

[10] This report was also made possible thanks to the Roundtable Rapporteurs, Mr. Manuel Imson, Mr. Paulo Cavaleri and Ms. Dominique Mineur and the note-taking efforts of Ms. Eugenia Lujan, Mr. Juan Carlos Narvaez and Ms. Karina Velasco.

demonstrated how it is possible to work jointly and together seek solutions that bring development for countries of origin, transit and destination.

RT Session 1.1: Partnerships for more regular and protected migration

(Co-Chairs: Brazil and France)

This session looked at how partnerships can be built to ensure that migration takes place in a regular and safe manner, as well as how orderly and safe migration are related to the maximization of the benefits of migration for the development of both countries of origin and destination. Moreover, this session enabled the exchange of different examples of best practices of partnerships for shared prosperity and shared responsibility among all stakeholders.

Main observations and findings

Delegates stressed that regular, orderly and safe migration is very important for sustainable economic development. They also agreed that it is essential to promote regular migration that respects human rights, and to leverage the development impacts of migrants (both economic and social) through effective partnerships between governments, diaspora groups, civil society and the private sector.

Many delegates pointed out that regular migration needs to be promoted, especially through bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and partnerships. This approach is central to preventing human trafficking and exploitation of migrants. Participants agreed that the human rights of all migrants, whether regular or undocumented, need to be respected

It was also suggested that countries of origin should provide information to potential migrants about the job opportunities in their labour markets, as well as offering a clear description of the work conditions and entry regulations. Moreover, it was stressed that there should be coherence between the demands of the labour markets in countries of origin and the visas that are given each year both for high skilled and low skilled migrants.

Some delegates underlined the importance of the regularization of migrants who are currently in irregular status in the countries of destination. It was stressed that those irregular migrants are one of the most vulnerable groups, and their migration status makes them an easier target for human trafficking and other forms of exploitation. Strong comments were made about how no human should be seen as "irregular", and therefore laws should not criminalize irregular migrants. It was also highlighted that it is important and necessary to disseminate knowledge at every level in order to fight erroneous or biased perceptions about migration and migrants. This would be beneficial for countries of origin, transit and destination, and especially for the migrants and their families.

There was a general consensus that migration is inherent to human nature and that *geography* (vicinity and regional relations) and *common history* (culture, language and tradition) can stimulate strong partnerships between countries, where migration can be a key issue. Participants recognized that partnerships are beneficial for countries of origin, transit and destination, as well as migrants themselves. They can help reduce the costs associated with diaspora outreach and increase the chance of successfully leveraging the positive development impacts of migration in a comprehensive and sustainable way. Partnerships for more regular and protected

migration can be pursued in various ways either at the global, regional, intra-regional or multilateral level. Also multi-stakeholder partnerships that bring in the full range of parties involved are critical.

With regard to *successful partnerships*, the following characteristics were outlined during this session:

1. The importance of shared responsibility and institutional coherence
2. The need to balance the migration interests of the countries
3. The importance of undergoing a trust-building exercise between parties
4. The need to be aware that partnerships are a long-term engagement from both sides,

   and that includes the investment of financial and personal resources, and
5. The importance of pursuing partnerships in a comprehensive manner involving a range of migration issues.

In addition, several examples of *best practices* were put forward:

- *Germany* has partnerships with Moldova and Georgia to offer mechanisms for regularizing the residency of migrant workers in a more efficient way. In the field of fighting irregular migration, the German police has been working with the Moldovan border police to strengthen their border control strategy and other basic training.
- *Brazil* has in the past year cooperated more strongly on migration issues with neighboring Argentina, Paraguay and Chile (Example: *Acuerdo Mercosur de Residencia* between Chile and Brazil). There are smoother mechanisms for naturalization and travel (passport requirements) between Mercosur members. There are also various partnerships between NGOs (civil society) and the government of Brazil that have been instrumental in the effort to regularize migration flows. A council of Brazilian representatives abroad to represent the diaspora and interact with the Brazilian government has also been established recently. Finally, another important partnership has been created by the Ministry of Foreign Relations, which organizes an international diaspora conference to provide a forum for the discussion of migration issues.
- The *United Kingdom* has a program that seeks to guarantee that high skilled workers who come to the U.K. obtain professional jobs that match their skills and are not downgraded to lower skilled labour. They have been working in particular with Nigeria and Ghana lately to reach out to the diaspora, as well as making migration flows more regularized and migrants less vulnerable to situations such as trafficking or smuggling.
- *Belarus* recently established an Anti-Trafficking Center that provides education and public awareness campaigns. Belarus is also establishing partnerships with various organizations in the area of migration, including UNHCR and others.
- Mali has an agreement with France which allows all aspects of migration to be addressed, including integration. They have a program to increase the *brain gain* factor for universities in Mali and a program that allows migrants in France to easily transfer remittances to Mali. There is also an agreement with

Spain that allows Malian workers to work in the agricultural sector in Spain in a regularized fashion.

Outcomes and Recommendations

1. Create an *interactive map on migration* to help delegates prepare discussions about migration, as well as create databases about migration flows to provide objective and reliable information, that can be used in the implementation of policies for migration and development.
2. Enforce the respect of relevant international conventions by all countries.
3. Promote programs to provide potential immigrants with relevant information to make well-informed decisions to prevent negative experiences of migration.
4. *Brain drain* is one of the problems that must be tackled by these partnerships. But *brain gain* and knowledge transfers also occur as a result of migration, and should be leveraged for development.
5. Promote the creation of job opportunities in the countries of origin to foster circular and return migration.
6. Origin and destination countries should avoid the criminalization of migrants; and in both destination and origin countries, it is important to allow for the dissemination of knowledge at every level in order to fight erroneous or biased perceptions about migration and migrants. At the same time, migrants themselves have to be informed about the challenges of migration.
7. Countries need to have a comprehensive policy and programs for returning migrants, both in the voluntary cases and in the forced cases. In the latter cases, it is especially important for countries of origin and destination to work together.
8. In sum, based on the variety of bilateral and regional partnerships discussed at the Roundtable, it is recommended that the *Platform for Partnerships* should be used as a tool for sharing best practices.

RT Session 1.2: Joint strategies to address irregular migration

(Co-Chairs: Ecuador and the Netherlands)

This session focused on three main discussions: effects, causes and solutions of irregular migration. More specifically, the Roundtable looked at strategies to improve the perceptions of migrants in origin, transit and destination countries; mechanisms to protect the rights and access to social services of irregular migrants; the causes of irregular migration; instruments to seek solutions to irregular migration, and examples of best practices regarding this issue.

Main observations and findings

The debate at this Roundtable was very valuable and varied, especially considering the complexities and controversies inherent to this topic. The debate included various aspects of irregular migration, beyond border control/deportation as a

solution to the problem, such as the need to identify innovative solutions to the issue, *including more regular channels for migration, preventive measures, protection* and the importance of safeguarding every State's sovereignty and right to decide their own migration policies.

Various delegations highlighted the importance of *joint strategies*, both bilateral and multilateral, to address the issue of irregular migration under a framework of shared responsibility by the countries of origin, transit and destination. The criminalization of irregular migrants puts them in an extremely vulnerable position. There is a need to overcome the current challenges of racism, xenophobia and discrimination, as well as other current biases in the public debate. The co-chairs and team members of the Roundtable highlighted the need for a greater focus on the human rights of irregular migrants, keeping in mind the negative aspects of the phenomenon, such as human trafficking and smuggling.

Some delegations stressed the economic pressure put on the welfare systems because of provision of services to irregular migrants. However, other delegations highlighted that this access was an essential part of safeguarding the human rights of migrants, which should not be tied to economic conditionality.

There was a consensus that migration is inherent in human nature and a *historical phenomenon* that has affected and will continue to affect most countries economically, socially and culturally; so we all have an important stake in the issue.

Regarding *public perceptions*, delegates stressed the need for joint communication and awareness campaigns between countries of origin, transit and destination as an important best practice to addressing the problems of discrimination and xenophobia, and a useful tool to lower the risks and vulnerabilities for the migrants.

There is a widely recognized need to *strengthen the protection of human rights of irregular migrants:* the more they are criminalized, the more vulnerable they will become. Following that line of thought, some of the delegates mentioned the regularization of irregular migrants as the main instrument to address the problem of vulnerability. There was a consensus that deportation and criminalization are not the answers. Some delegates also stressed that the available data on irregular migrants do not provide a basis for the criminalization, which often affects them.

Participants at this session recognized the lack of development in the countries of origin as one of the causes of irregular migration. Therefore, many delegates also stressed the need for sustainable development in the countries of origin, including decent labour conditions, as a way of giving people the right to not migrate. It was also suggested that it is important to overcome the economic imbalances between countries.

On *irregular migration*, participants repeatedly stressed the need for regularization. Aside from regularization, other instruments were mentioned by the delegates, such as the need for new migration regimes like those that exist at the regional level in various parts of the world. Likewise, there is a need for more channels for regular migration, particularly for low-skilled migrants, who are most affected by irregular migration. On this point, it was argued that circular or temporary migration schemes could be good practices; provided they are fair in granting access to human rights and provide a means of achieving permanent residence and citizenship. However, some participants did not agree that regularization was the solution for irregular migration.

It was proposed that the *response to irregular migration* must include the following components:

1. *Prevention* (inform people of risks of irregular migration);
2. *Protection* (those in need of humanitarian protection should receive it in the host country and along their route);
3. *Integration and re-integration*; and
4. *Prosecution* (of criminals who exploit the vulnerable situation of migrants).

Regarding current *best practices*, the following were mentioned:

- In East Africa, the U.K. is working on a soap opera where they inserted a story line about the use of visa centres and highlighted the dangers of using smugglers or traffickers to enter the U.K. illegally.
- In the United States, there is a program that provides special visas to victims of human trafficking who are willing to assist in the prosecution of their traffickers.
- Russia has an agreement with 9 countries that has established a joint commission to provide a forum to discuss issues of irregular migration. They are also working together with their neighbours in the prevention of human trafficking. One of their joint efforts is a public awareness campaign to prevent human trafficking.
- The government of Chile has recently enacted laws to regularize Peruvians living in Chile.
- The Moldovan government is implementing a complex and multidimensional program to strengthen the national capacity of public authorities to deal with issues of irregular migration and trafficking, enhance border management capacity to combat trafficking and smuggling (also working with Ukrainian border patrol), and promote information-sharing, internally and internationally. Moldova has also put in place several new mechanisms to ensure the protection of Moldovan citizens abroad, including the "National Referral" mechanism for vulnerable groups like victims of trafficking and unaccompanied minors.
- Lebanon recently drafted a law to Combat Human Trafficking that is waiting to be passed by Congress.

Outcomes and Recommendations

1. Governments must continue to discuss the various challenges and aspects of this subject in future discussions at the Forum. It was suggested that irregular migration remains on the agenda of the Global Forum and other upcoming international conferences.
2. Governments should consider circular or temporary migration schemes, provided they are fair in granting access to human rights and provide a means to achieving permanent residence and citizenship.
3. Joint mechanisms for international cooperation at the multilateral, regional and bilateral levels should be established to minimize irregular migration. These must be founded on the principle of shared responsibility between countries of origin, transit and destination, and should include *inter alia* exchanges of information on human trafficking and smuggling.
4. Governments must keep in mind the right to not migrate. There is a need for more empirical data and resources to address this right.
5. The respect for human rights of migrants, regardless of their immigration status, is an absolute threshold principle.
6. Governments must also remember that there is a need for national leaders to frame the public debate underlining the positive contribution of regular and irregular migrants to host societies.
7. Governments must prosecute criminal organizations involved in trafficking and smuggling through joint efforts that involve various international and local actors.
8. Governments must close the gaps of coordination and cooperation between countries of origin, transit and destination. We must also search for cooperation in information sharing, internally and internationally.
9. Governments must close the gaps of coordination and cooperation between countries of origin, transit and destination. We must also search for cooperation in information sharing, internally and internationally.
10. Communication and awareness campaigns must be conducted to foster ways to share information in countries of origin and transit, as well as destination.

6.2 ROUNDTABLE 2: HUMAN MOBILITY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

(Coordinator: Dr. Irena Omelaniuk)[11]

This Roundtable explored strategic policies to improve access to regular forms of migration, and to social security services (including health) that can strengthen the personal development prospects and outcomes for migrants and their families. It

[11] This chapter was based on the reports of the Roundtable session rapporteurs, Mr. Johan Fick, South Africa (RT 2.1), and Mr. Vaheh Gevorgyan, Armenia (RT 2.2), and the notes of the session note-takers, Mr. Juan Carlos Calleros, Center for Migration Studies, Mexico, and Mr. Aaron Terrazas, MPI Washington, and the RT Coordinator.

also mainstreamed gender and family within the GFMD as two new analytical perspectives from which to examine the human development potential and impacts of migration abroad and at home. It looked at policy options for short and longer term migration, but with a special focus on temporary and circular labour mobility, where migrants are often most vulnerable.

The discussions benefited from studies commissioned by the *ad hoc* Working Group on protecting and empowering migrants for development on low cost loans for migrants[12] and social security options for temporary/circulating labour migrants.[13] It also drew experiences from current pilot labour migration programs, such as the circular migration agreement between Mauritius and France and the foreign labour program between the UAE and Bangladesh, India and Philippines. The debate profited from the joint efforts of UNIFEM (part of UN Women) and IOM,[14] and from preparatory consultations organized by UNIFEM and the Mexican Government (see RT 2.2 below).

RT Session 2.1: Reducing the costs of migration and maximizing human development

(Co-chairs: Sri Lanka; Sweden; United Arab Emirates)

This session addressed three questions relating to: keeping migration expenses low for migrants, migrant access to social security and health, and other policies that affect migration costs and the capacity of people to migrate and circulate by choice.

Main observations and findings

a) How can governments ensure that recruiters and other intermediaries keep migration expenses low for migrants?

High up-front costs of migration (e.g. for labour recruitment) can have far-reaching consequences for how people migrate and the developmental outcomes of their mobility. They need to be addressed jointly by countries of origin and destination in cooperation with private sector and other stakeholders. National efforts alone are rarely sufficient.

Delegates agreed that *information to migrants* is a first step to lowering costs, as it enables them to negotiate with labour recruiters and other intermediaries from a stronger starting position. *One-stop-shops* offering up-front services (information, passports, medicals, visa processing, contracts, etc.) available to aspiring emigrants in Philippines and Thailand are an effective tool for this. Indonesia has decentralized its *one-stop shops* to the provincial levels to save migrants costly travel expenses. Chile has established a low cost passports and identification document service in 120 Consulates around the world in order to ease the process for returning Chilean migrants. Legal limits set on fees, as in the Philippines and Indonesia, can also protect migrants from extortive practices by unscrupulous recruitment agencies.

[12] Philip Martin, "Reducing the Cost Burden for Migrant Workers: A Market-based Approach", August 30, 2009.

[13] Robert Holzmann and Yann Pouget, "Social Protection for Temporary Migrant Workers: Conceptual Framework, Country Inventory, Assessment and Guidance", a study prepared for the Global Forum on Migration and Development by the World Bank and Marseille Center for Mediterranean Integration, Marseille, October 27, 2010.

[14] See the Annex to the RT 2.2 Background Paper, on the global care economy and chains.

The question remained: how can governments finance such programs and services to migrants? Some assume the costs directly; some cost-share with other players; and others are using IT to lower the costs.

Low cost loans schemes for migrants can be another effective way to reduce costs. In Sri Lanka, three State banks offer such loans, both to ease the cost burden on migrants and encourage formal remittances through banks. Repayments are generally high, except where the migrants are not paid on time. Commercial banks are also encouraged to enter into such schemes. Indonesia also offers low cost loans schemes to its emigrants through State banks; and Bangladesh recently created an Expatriate Welfare Bank to offer collateral-free loans to migrants and to returnees. All of these schemes have had varying degrees of success and failure; a key challenge being the lack of repayment guarantees.

Regulating the intermediaries, such as labour recruiters, was seen as another area where governments need to play a stronger role. This could be achieved in two ways: a) a national registry of agencies that are certified and licensed; and b) a balanced combination of controls (e.g. certification, or standard capped fees, such as set by Italy, Spain and Philippines) and incentives (such as preferential lists of exemplary agencies, or allocating exit quotas to well-functioning firms).[15] To further streamline its admission of highly qualified, Russia aims to better control recruitment through *one-stop-shop* recruitment/training/medical check-up centres in countries of origin. Other good practices include self-regulation of agencies through membership in larger professional associations, which can commit members to no or low fees; and codes of conduct.

The private sector could also play a constructive role by checking the validity of contracts before migrants leave, and following up on employer behaviour abroad. In a lucrative global labour market, where there are major vested interests, regulation of recruiting agencies calls for close cross-border cooperation.

Bilateral temporary or circular migration agreements involving Ministries and employers directly, with or without intermediaries, were seen as effective frameworks for protecting migrants and keeping the costs of migration low. The bilateral programs between Mauritius-France/Canada or Mexico-Canada, and the government-run and administered employment permit system between Asian countries and Korea (which has cut migration costs by one-third) offer some workable models.

The UAE are looking to test low cost loans schemes in their pilot temporary labour migration program with Asian countries; also for the lessons these could yield for the GFMD. The UAE and Switzerland co-organized an international *workshop on the migrant recruitment industry in Dubai in January 2011.*

b) Ensuring migrants have access to social benefits

Migrant health was discussed as a key determinant of empowerment and protection of migrants, particularly women and children.[16] Access to health for migrants was

[15] It was noted that an over-reliance on controls can lead to more irregular migration and the use of unregulated channels (or further corruption and collusion among criminal elements that can result in higher fees to migrants).

[16] See the Resolution at the 61st World Health Assembly in 2008 calling on governments to develop migrant-friendly health environments. Also, two regional meetings in 2010 -to prepare a) for the Colombo Process and b) for the GFMD meeting- examined migration health issues and made further recommendations in this regard.

possible in a number of ways: as part of the universal health care in countries of destination, through bilateral or multilateral cooperation between countries, and via special programs for migrants in vulnerable situations.

Universal access to health care was identified as the most cost effective model for health care delivery, since migrants tend to be younger and use health services less intensively. Some origin and destination countries already offer this (Spain, Sweden, Portugal, Argentina, Brazil). But such benefits may only be temporary or restricted in type. It was agreed that access should be equal, not just for some migrants, and should place no undue cost on the migrant and family. Regularization of migrants in irregular situations was considered an effective way to assure health cover for all (e.g. in Chile and Argentina).

A greater focus on *preventive care* for all, not just emergency care, was seen as economically smart and public health-wise. There should be greater development investment in origin countries with high disease prevalence, as well as in linguistically-sensitive services in the countries of destination. To date, few bilateral agreements on migration provide for health care, despite the fact that this can improve productivity of migrant workers.

Some countries of origin are taking exemplary action: Sri Lanka has set up a multi-stakeholder process to examine primary and longer term sustainable health care for migrants, and the linked interests of origin and destination countries. Mexico collaborates with hundreds of migrant associations, churches, universities, health clinics etc. in the US to ensure adequate health care and information to its migrants there; Philippines and Korea provide mandatory insurance for their nationals going abroad. *One government suggested that the health of migrants should be a core principle of the GFMD, and should be dealt with in future meetings.*

Social security and income security were identified as critical to the well-being of migrants and their families, particularly those engaging in temporary or circular migration.[17] Some high income countries offer contributory pension schemes for migrants, but mostly only for permanent or longer term migrants. Spain and Chile permit their temporary migrants to voluntarily retain their accumulated social security benefits when they return home. Korea provides medical assistance, full mandatory insurance, severance payment and job training to its workers, in partnership with NGOs. Other options include end-of-contract payments, as mandated in the UAE, but these can be difficult to enforce with employers.

Some developing countries have resorted to their own strategies: Thailand has an employer/employee contributions-based health and social security scheme for labour migrants on contract, and allows irregular migrants to pay into the universal health scheme. Cameroon has a non-discriminatory policy for its *émigrés* and immigrants; and agreements with other countries to cover pensions. Philippines has social security agreements with a host of other countries, but like Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Thailand also manages a Migrant Welfare Fund to cover health care, medical evacuations, return support, retirement, education, etc. Indonesia has no bilateral social security agreements, but offers its emigrant workers accident and life insurance to cover all stages of the migration cycle. There still remain obstacles to its effectiveness, including enforcement.

[17] See Footnote 12 on the study by Holzmann and Pouget.

The session recognized that no single scheme or benefits model is optimal for temporary migrant workers, and depended on factors such as length of stay and skills levels. Delegates felt that the best solutions are likely to be found at bilateral and regional levels. The Ibero-American Conference of Heads of State and Presidents is pioneering a globalized social security scheme for Ibero-American workers in Spain, which guarantees acquired rights to families and portability of old-age and disability pensions between countries. This was ratified in 2010 by Spain, and will come into effect once seven countries have ratified it.[18]

The study commissioned by the Working Group on protecting and empowering migrants for development analyzed existing pension and health benefit schemes and how they might be re-designed for application and portability by temporary foreign workers.[19] The options range from end-of-service lump sum payments by employers to fully defined, migrant/employer contributions-based schemes, also with portable benefits. The UAE hopes to benefit from the study in formulating its own future policies.

c) What other policy areas affect migration costs and the ability of migrants and their families to choose to migrate and circulate in pursuit of better prospects?

Delegates also discussed the fact that keeping migration costs low can *facilitate both managed and spontaneous circular migration*, as well as promote the development impact of this kind of mobility. Some countries saw circular migration as important for development. For Mauritius, for example, circular migration agreements (e.g. with France) are part of the national human resource development plan. Providing an enabling legislative framework can also facilitate spontaneous circular migration, e.g. through dual citizenship, facilitated re-entry, absence from the host country without loss of residency rights, and portability of pensions and social rights.

The Swedish Parliamentary Committee for Circular Migration and Development, set up in 2009, also found that *effective integration* can promote spontaneous circular migration, as migrants are more likely to return and reintegrate in the origin country (if only temporarily or repeatedly) if they are secure in the country of destination. The EC is promoting pilot programs with African partner countries, which include *capacity building* of public institutions and services, and skills evaluation and mechanisms to support return migration.[20] By the end of 2010, the Commission will complete a major study on circular migration that could yield useful lessons for the GFMD. *It was suggested that the GFMD continue to provide a platform to study circular migration — also in the context of reducing the costs of migration.*

Since the transfer of knowledge and skills through circular migration can also strengthen the economic competitiveness of countries of origin and countries of destination, there is increasing investment in the *education, training and skills recognition* of migrants. Germany, Japan and South Korea have invested in educational facilities in Sri Lanka to help train the emigrating labour force to international standards. Similar initiatives have existed for some time in the

[18] The multilateral agreement on social security covers old age pensions.

[19] See Footnote 12. The study compared voluntary with mandatory schemes, and those that transition into mandatory schemes. For pensions, a defined contribution approach appears to lend itself more easily to portability across professions and borders.

[20] See the EC draft proposal for seasonal workers and pilot programs between France and Benin, Cameroon, Mali and Senegal, and with Tunisia.

Philippines. In the EC and French programs with Mauritius and Mali, the country of destination helps pay for the migrant training, while a triple lump sum is offered if the migrant returns to the country of origin.[21] And resource centres such as the German-supported Information Centre in Uzbekistan are offering education, training, financial literacy courses and support for start-up activities in the home country when the migrants return.

Training and skills recognition should also be available in the country of destination, both for the work at hand and the longer term human development of the migrant. Japan's program for trainee nurses from Philippines offers language and skills training *in situ* while they are employed at local wage and work standards.[22] Mexico has negotiated innovative/unique certification arrangements with companies and universities for its migrants in certain sectors in the US. Under its Mobility Partnership with EU countries, Moldova has negotiated mutual qualifications/skills recognition and equivalence procedures with the EU partners.

Delegates were left with questions about the real costs of such programs, and whether they are working on a meaningful scale as "good practices". And if not, why not?

Outcomes and recommendations

1. Examine issues around recruitment and engage recruitment agencies in better preparing and protecting overseas contract workers (UAE held a workshop in Dubai early 2011).
2. Promote monitoring and licensing systems for recruiters and other intermediaries. Develop (or implement existing) codes of conduct and registers for recruiters.
3. Explore and evaluate innovative approaches to providing low-cost loans for migrants.
4. Promote cooperation mechanisms between countries of origin and destination for better job matching and skills recognition.
5. Promote portability of pensions and other social rights; explore social security and end-of-contract payment models for temporary labour migrants (e.g. based on the study commissioned by the working group on protecting and empowering migrants for development on this issue).
6. Promote one-stop-shops in countries of origin and destination for information on migration and return (also circular migration), to minimize the "information asymmetry" for migrants.
7. Assess cost effective health care models for various types of migration scenarios.
8. Analyze and minimize the costs associated with managed and spontaneous forms of circular migration.

[21] Note Mauritius complements this with its own strategic alliances with Mauritian Universities and vocational training institutes.

[22] This program is still too small, and fraught with challenges such as the difficulty of passing the language exams, to be assessed as a "good practice" at this stage.

T Session 2.2: Migration, gender and family

(Chair: Mexico)

This session was based on the principle outlined in the Background Paper, that the developmental effects of migration can be broadened when gender and family concerns are included in the policy equation. Despite their importance for achieving the Millennium Development Goals, the GFMD to date has given marginal attention to these issues. The session took up two challenges: how to sustain transnational families and how to resolve the problems of transnational families, particularly for women and children.

The session was divided into four sections around the guiding questions in the Background Paper, each one jointly facilitated by a government and international organization, members of the RT team that had prepared the session throughout the year.

Main observations and findings

An overarching theme of the session was *family unity*. Regardless of where it takes place, and what the definition of family, family unity was considered an optimal outcome for families separated or fractured by migration. Both in the family and individually, women migrants contribute significantly to development; yet they are often the most vulnerable, excluded, exploited or simply ignored by policy. Protecting them amounts to an investment in their human development and that of the family and society.

Today, as people circulate more, there is a need to adjust and calibrate policies accordingly. The causes and impacts of migration can be positive and negative for men and women, children, adolescents and families generally. But there remains a lack of gender-sensitive policies related to circular movement and its potential for development.

a) Policies and programs to support and provide benefits to families in "transnational" situations.

Families can find themselves in three "transnational" situations: the family spread across countries, both parents abroad (with other relatives caring for the children), or one parent at home and one abroad. This can have deep and long-term social and economic impacts on the family, particularly the education and health of children. The sex of the parent is a strong determining factor in how to cope with this; and public policies need to take account of it.

Family reunification opportunities were seen by delegates as optimal in transnational situations. A recent poll conducted by Armenia among its returned *émigrés* showed that family reunification was important for migrants, and that the policy environment should favour this at either end of the migration spectrum.[23] But in cases where family unification was not yet possible, support mechanisms and communication devices across borders can ease the strains of separation. The Philippine Overseas Workers' Welfare Administration (OWWA) aims to keep

[23] The study showed that emigrants accompanied by family tended to be more successful abroad; while 25% of Armenian *émigrés* actually returned in order to be reunited with their family.

families intact through welfare offices that provide support at home and overseas.[24] Diaspora can also play an important role in connecting persons abroad with their families.

Philippines and Sri Lanka are also *using IT to bridge distances*. Both have partnered with Microsoft to train migrant workers abroad and their families at home in how to use communications technology to maintain contact across borders. Israel also has a program to strengthen the ties of its Filipino care workers with their families, including training for Filipino diaspora organizations; and a joint program between Ukraine and Italy provides Skype training to families back home. How do governments pay for these initiatives to ensure sustainability? The Philippine method of funding its overseas welfare support structure from the Filipino Welfare Fund was considered a practical model worth emulating.

The session concluded that there are still insufficient data on transnational families and on policies to deal with them. These could be collected at all stages of migration via Migration Profiles.

b) Partnerships to assist children who are alone in the country of origin and those separated from their parents in countries of destination.

Delegates reported that where children were deprived of parents and/or family through migration, they invariably suffered a decline in care and access to education and social protection, while the lack of regular avenues to migration may push children to migrate on their own, and expose themselves to criminal activities, including smuggling and trafficking in persons. This was often exacerbated by their irregular status, or that of their parents, and by immigration policies. In particular, it was recognized that unilateral measures are insufficient to provide for the wellbeing of unaccompanied migrant children.

UNICEF sees the rights of the child and family reunification as fundamental principles to be included in immigration law.[25] Partnerships with academia can deepen the research required to revise immigration laws and practices. But the political will was needed to close the gap between well-meaning laws and actual practice.

Increasingly, countries of origin are taking action. Mexico has a multi-pronged, cross-sectoral strategy on its borders to assist both unaccompanied returning Mexican children from the north and immigrant children from the south. Respecting the rights of the child, also to live in a family, the Government's primary concerns are with health and education, returning the children safely to their families and/or caring for them in one of 27 centres in Mexico, which also assist non-Mexican children. Officers for protection of infants (OPIs) have been trained by the National Migration Institute and are now part of an approach also being considered in Guatemala and Honduras, while returned children are included in local projects in partnership with Save the Children and HSBC. The success of this integrated approach to protecting, supporting and reintegrating returned unaccompanied

[24] These deliver psycho-social counseling, orientation for women, and for men left behind with children, child counseling, reintegration preparedness, financial literacy and skills upgrading for women abroad, family circles and scholarships for children.

[25] The Convention on the Rights of the Child was signed 1989, came into force 1990; and was ratified by 194 countries in 2009.

minors is in part due to the high-level political commitment it enjoys, notably from Mexico's First Lady, Margarita Zavala. Mexico is now exploring integrated data systems to improve the program.

Moldova has collected evidence on the negative impacts of the migration of parents on the behaviour, education and health of children (and elderly) left behind; and has set up a National Action Plan to address their needs. Moldova has a joint program with Italy, co-funded by the EU, to *enhance the capacity* of authorities to address these needs. Thailand has set up a Child Protection Monitoring System jointly with UNICEF and a university to collect baseline data for future policies on migrant children. Mauritania has also worked with UNICEF to protect unaccompanied minors, and under its new Immigration Policy will partner with the EU on programs to protect women and children. Indonesia encourages NGOs to provide services to children left behind; and offers skills training to those who have dropped out of school.

In Latin America, regional processes like the Mesoamerican or Ibero-American Conference, or the South American Conference on Migration, increasingly see a need for standard, regional policies based on respect for the human rights of all migrants, and tailored to each country's needs. Governments called for more flexible visa and resident status policies, and to halt detention of children or imposition of long term bans on the return of deportees. In Sub Saharan Africa, many countries lack the institutional structures and resources to address this issue; and some governments are calling for capacity building support.

Countries hosting migrant children also underscored the need for countries of origin to prevent the tragedy of parents sending their children abroad alone, where even if they receive education and integration assistance, they may be denied their right to live and develop in a family. Spain has bilateral arrangements with Morocco and Senegal to prevent such unaccompanied migration, improve protection while abroad and assist with return.

c) How to address the concerns of unregistered children in countries of destination with parents in undocumented or irregular situations.

The discussion on this issue was closely linked to that above. Delegates understood that the international framework already exists to protect children in such circumstances: all UN Conventions refer to the rights of the child, regardless of their status, and to the best interests of the child. But it was insufficient to simply sign/ratify the Conventions; practical implementation at national level was still lacking.

The *right to identity* still posed a major challenge. In a world where some 50 million births go unregistered each year (either because of irregular status, fear of detection and other obstacles, including language barriers), migrant children are among the most severely affected. They can be prevented from accessing health care and education; and can be denied essential immunization. They can face practical/legal obstacles, and detention in inadequate facilities. Delegates asked why there was such a gap between the international principles, national legislation and immigration practices. Was it a resources gap, knowledge gap, or commitment gap? Again, the serious dearth of data on children was noted, particularly undocumented or children of undocumented migrants.

Delegates agreed the best approach may be to ratify all relevant conventions and ensure national implementation.

d) Tools and mechanisms to orient, support, protect and empower female migrants at all points in the migration cycle.

Delegates agreed that women and child migrants should be able to *access basic social benefits* (including health and education) on the same basis as nationals in the destination countries, a right enshrined in core international human rights instruments. In particular, it was accepted that health services have to reach out to female migrants. EU countries like Portugal and Spain have mainstreamed gender and family in their national strategy for migrant integration, to assure access to services, particularly child and maternal health care, under their general public health systems. In Portugal, mainstreaming gender in all areas of public policy is considered a prerequisite for good governance.

Special protection is required particularly where women or children are domestic (or other) workers in countries that do not give full legal recognition to this kind of work (Bolivia's Constitution gives this recognition) , or are at risk of becoming victims of criminal networks and trafficking.

Some recent good practices include: 1) Improved pre-departure information and orientation to women emigrants by Indonesia and Nepal (after lifting the bans on their out-migration); 2) Jordan recognizes domestic work in its labour legislation, and uses standard, rights-based, legally enforceable contracts and mechanisms for monitoring and grievance redressal; 3) Sri Lanka promotes legal migration through tailored information, incentives to register legally and tickets issued based on proper documentation and registration; 4) Indonesia and Nepal are strengthening the capacities of women migrant groups and local communities to collect data and track families and separated women and children, and act as community watchdogs against traffickers; 5) Hong Kong allows women migrant workers to organize in unions, which work with local trade unions, to improve their wage and work conditions; and 6) the US only issues visas to domestic employees on the basis of a contract stating the pay and duties of the employee; and after applicants have understood the pamphlet on the rights of certain work visa applicants in the US.

Information to migrants prior to emigration is another well tried empowerment strategy by the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka and others. Under its legislation to protect the wellbeing and workplace safety of domestic workers, Singapore runs a Safety Awareness Course for first-time domestic workers, an Employer Orientation program for first-time employers of such workers, and a helpline for domestic workers in distress. Employers are monitored and held accountable for their treatment of these workers.[26]

In many instances, countries have good laws but implementation and execution remain incomplete due to a lack of appropriate policies and institutions. Not all countries or regions have the capacities to carry out these programs and policies and would clearly benefit from capacity building.

[26] Employers prosecuted for abuse and/or failing to provide safe working conditions are brought to attention during the training. Employers are required to bring domestic workers to the Ministry of Manpower for face-to-face interviews.

It was proposed, and supported by some governments in the session, that a gender working group be established in the GFMD to help with RT 2.2 follow-up, which should include the development of gender sensitive guidelines for policies, programs and budgets, and appropriate indicators.[27]

Outcomes and recommendations

1. Policy makers should take the family into account at all stages of migration policy. In particular, policymakers should consider implementing regularization schemes for irregular migrants with children that by birth are nationals of the country of destination.
2. The GFMD can help adjustment to changes in family structures by making available on its website best practices identified in its meetings, so that countries can learn from each other, and to inform policy responses to the new challenges.
3. Member States should ratify all UN Conventions that refer to the rights of the child, and then promote national implementation.
4. Incorporate migrant women into the agenda of the African Women's Decade, launched 24/10/10.
5. Establish an *ad hoc* Working Group on Gender within the GFMD (the Mexican Chair of the session recommends the Working Group address both Gender and Family issues).
6. Develop gender-sensitive guidelines on policies, programs and budgets, with appropriate indicators.

6.3 ROUNDTABLE 3: POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL COHERENCE TO ADDRESS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

(Coordinator: Dr. Rolph K. Jenny)[28]

Since the first GFMD meeting in Brussels, policy and institutional coherence to address the relationship between migration and development have been central to the GFMD discussions and process.

In the first session, the GFMD meeting in Mexico pursued these debates with special focus on the assessment of the *impact of migration on social and economic*

[27] This echoed the recommendations of the high level consultations co-organized by UNIFEM (now part of UN Women) and Mexico on 7-8 September 2010 on "Protecting and Promoting the Rights of Women Migrant Workers: Partnerships for human development: shared prosperity - shared responsibility", which sought more action on implementing RT 2.2 outcomes.

[28] This chapter is based on the reports of the Roundtable 3 General Rapporteur Ambassador Maria Bassols, the Roundtable Session Rapporteurs Prof. Susan Martin (RT 3.1), Prof. Ronald Skeldon (RT 3.2) and Mr. David DiGiovanna (RT 3.3), and the notes of the session note-takers, Ms. Milena Novy-Marx, MacArthur Foundation, USA, and Ms. Nina Frias Valle, Center for Migration Studies, Mexico; and the RT Coordinator. The session background papers were prepared by Dr. Khalid Koser (RT 3.1), Prof. Ronald Skeldon (RT 3.2) and Ms. Maureen Achieng (RT 3.3).

development; the need to develop effective tools for key data in support of coherent migration and development policies, inter alia through the *migration profiles*; and recent initiatives for *mainstreaming migration into development planning*. In the second session, Roundtable 3 introduced a new subject, *the relevance and impact of climate change on migration and development*. Recognizing that policy coherence by governments and other actors is also relevant in this increasingly important area, and that little if any discussion has occurred so far between states and other actors on this topic, this session aimed at sharing information on data, current practices and challenges for concerned policy makers. The third session of Roundtable 3 dealt once more with *Regional Consultative Processes and Inter-regional Fora* and discussed how such processes can best include the migration and development nexus in their agendas.

RT Session 3.1: Assessing the impact of migration on the economic and social development and addressing its cause-effect relationship

(Co-chairs: Argentina, Kenya and Switzerland)

In line with the follow-up recommendations of the 2009 Athens GFMD meeting and the June 2010 Vienna seminar on '*Assessing the impacts of migration and development policies*' organized by the Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research, the discussion in session 3.1 touched on the connections between migration and development and on ways to improve related policy coherence. The debate focused on three themes: *impact assessment, migration profiles and mainstreaming migration into development planning*.

Main observations and findings

a) Impact Assessment

The session discussed ways to assess impacts both at the macro-level and with regard to specific policies, programs and projects. Regarding the macro-level, participants noted the importance of examining the effects of migration on the development of both migration origin and destination countries. Important indicators of impact include: reductions or increases in poverty; economic growth; investment; productivity; achievement of such Millennium Development Goals as improvements in health and education outcomes; women's empowerment; family cohesion; community infrastructure and issues related to discrimination and exclusion of migrants.

Participants then reported on a variety of specific programs and projects that link migration and development and would benefit from rigorous assessment. These included programs to help migrants invest in their home country; reintegrate returning migrants; build capacity of diaspora organizations; train migrants for higher paying employment in foreign countries; recruit qualified migrants to fill gaps in the labour force; address brain drain; and tap into the human resources of the diaspora to rebuild countries affected by conflict.

Participants also discussed the benefits of promoting a 'culture of evaluation' that would help ensure that policies, programs and projects are having the policy benefits that were intended. One participant stated, "it's important to do these initiatives 'right,' not just do them", and participants stressed the importance of

leadership within government agencies as a pre-condition to instilling such a culture.

Participants then pointed out that good impact evaluations require *rigorous methods* and *take time to accomplish*. The importance of engaging outside expertise from academia and international agencies was emphasized. Pilot studies are often a useful way of testing the impact of new policies and programs before taking them to scale. The session discussed the importance of collecting baseline data, using multi-disciplinary techniques and establishing the counter-factual (to allow the evaluation to determine what might have happened in the absence of the new policies, programs and projects). They also described longitudinal studies under way that will allow governments to collect data on impacts over an extended period. Participants emphasized the importance of taking gender into account, and also noted the need to establish a mechanism to share information on indicators, methods and the evaluations that are produced.

b) Migration Profiles

Participants were provided with an Information Note on Migration Profiles, outlining the nature and principal objectives of migration profiles, including the more comprehensive 'Extended Migration Profiles'. The ensuing discussion showed considerable consensus that for some countries such migration profiles are valuable both as a *longer-term process* and for the *immediate information* produced. They provide a logical framework for collecting and analyzing information on emigration of citizens and immigration of foreign nationals into the territory of the profiled country. The profiles generally synthesize existing data, which, as participants pointed out, can also be useful for the type of *impact assessments* described above. The process through which profiles are carried out also *builds capacity* of governments to undertake this type of analysis.

Participants pointed to a number of *challenges* in developing migration profiles. The *paucity of good data* on migration poses particular difficulties for governments, as do problems arising in *updating the information*. Participants presented innovative practices of identifying nationals living abroad, including one effort to register voters in consulates that, in turn, provide additional information about numbers and characteristics of migrants. Finding data may be eased when the 2010-2011 global round of censuses is completed, because many countries are asking residents to provide their country of birth. In this context, participants also noted that the *Migrants Count* report provides useful recommendations to governments on ways to improve data collection on migration.

The importance of establishing bilateral and regional collaboration to collect information from both origin and destination countries was also emphasized. One participant noted that the template used in the migration profiles could help governments collect information on *internal migrants* as well as *international migrants*.

Participants underscored in particular that countries undertaking migration profiles must take ownership of the process in order to ensure that the final product reflects their needs and priorities. Participants described the value of establishing *intra-governmental coordination mechanisms* to develop the profiles. In at least one case, the office responsible for development planning took leadership in convening other

ministries, which helped ensure that the profile was used in other planning processes.

c) Mainstreaming Migration into Development

Participants reiterated the importance of mainstreaming discussion of the impacts of migration into a variety of development planning process, referencing the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), Millennium Development Goals, and National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs). The need for effective tools to help governments mainstream was raised, and participants welcomed the recent publication of *Mainstreaming migration into development planning: A handbook for policy-makers and practitioners*, prepared by the Global Migration Group. They also noted the establishment of the ACP Observatory on Migration as a useful step towards improving data and research that will be useful in development planning. They finally called on governments to bring the evidence generated by impact assessments and migration profiles into the development planning process.

Outcomes and recommendations

. Interested governments, with the assistance of international organizations and external experts, should:

1. Develop and assess indicators of the impact of migration on development, using rigorous methods of evaluation.
2. Establish a *clearing house* that would include information on indicators, methods of evaluations and documents of relevant impact assessments of policies, programs and projects linking migration and development.
3. Continue to produce and update Migration Profiles that use a standardized template but provide flexibility that allows the information to be tailored to the priorities of the countries concerned.
4. Encourage the use of the GMG publication "*Mainstreaming migration into development planning: A handbook for policy-makers and practitioners*".
5. Encourage the implementation of the recommendations on improving the collection of data on migrants in census, survey and administrative systems, as described in the "Migrants Count" report.

RT Session 3.2: Assessing the relevance and impact of climate change on migration and development

(Co-chairs: Bangladesh and the United Kingdom)

The purpose of this session was to have a first dialogue within the GFMD on current data on the issue of climate change and its impact on migration and development, to share such information, to hear reports of experts and countries affected by the phenomenon, to review related policy challenges and to assess the need for governments and other actors to strengthen consultations in a context of policy coherence on migration and development. The session saw a lively debate with some 43 interventions, which were constructive and often detailed, and demonstrated the interest of participants in analyzing the link between climate

change, migration and development. Participants also included a number of representatives of small island states.

The debate focused on such issues as 1) the quality of data and research on climate change, migration and development, and how such data could be improved and what the future priorities should be; 2) lessons learned from National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and Disaster Risk Reduction Strategies (DRRs), their integration into national development planning and how migration considerations can be included in these frameworks; 3) the management of risks in vulnerable zones, including contingency planning and possible relocation or resettlement of affected persons; 4) the key challenges for migration and development policy in destination countries, including adaptation support for countries where climate change is gradual and people have time to plan how to respond; 5) best practices to assist the most vulnerable countries, especially the poorest among them, as well as small island states to address climate-induced displacement of populations; and 6) how governments and other stakeholders could strengthen consultations on policy challenges and solutions related to climate-induced migration.

Main observations and findings

Recognizing the multiple drivers of migration (economic, family, political, conflict, etc.) participants agreed that climate change is an additional yet increasingly important factor of human mobility. Much of climate-induced movement is *internal* as people move away but may also return, and affects primarily developing countries. One out of 19 persons living in developing countries may be affected, in comparison to 1 out of 1,500 persons living in OECD countries.

However, *exact impacts of climate change on migration and development are difficult to predict* because of the wide variation in estimates of global numbers of people that could potentially be affected, and because of terminological differences. For example, estimates of people affected by climate -induced disasters between 2000 and 2004 mention some 240 million or 62 million a year. Another prediction suggests that up to 1 billion people may be forced to move between 2007 and 2050, which sounds a lot but, at some 23 million a year, is fewer than the estimates of 62 million a year for the period 2000-2004.

While participants agreed that a considerable amount of information either already exists or is in the process of being collected, they also recognized that data to assess and analyze the impact of climate change on migration are still weak. Some governments mentioned surveys they are supporting in order to gauge the impact of climate change on population displacement, and which will be published in the near future. Participants in particular emphasized that *a lack of data should not be used as an excuse for not taking action.* In some areas, action was required now, and the issue of urgency was raised by several participants.

Also, capacity building in both the methodologies of data collection and of analysis of the data was required, and relevant historical data needed to be examined in order to generate a longitudinal approach to the topic. Some participants called for more focused and practice-oriented research that should offer concrete advice to affected countries, while others suggested creating a virtual library for available and future data, research and analyses on the topic.

There was consensus that the impact of climate change on migration and development, for all its uncertainty, was a *cross-cutting and multi-sectoral issue*. Climate change and environmental degradation hinder development by affecting people's economic, food and water security conditions which, in turn, push affected persons to move. The impact of climate change *cannot, therefore, be isolated from other factors that induce or force people to move. Food and water security* were raised by many participants as central to any understanding of future migrations that might be due to environmental change. For example, changing crop patterns because of climate change can have a clear impact on food security of whole societies.

Participants reaffirmed that the impact of climate change is particularly felt in poorer countries, in part because of population size and growth and lower capability to adapt to climate change, in part because a number of countries are located in types of environments that are most likely affected by climate change. Differences across regions were mentioned and participants concurred that *size and geography matter*. Representatives of small island states mentioned their especially vulnerable position, where action is required now since the very existence of some states was at risk, not least because there is *no space available for internal relocation*.

The delegate from Pakistan mentioned that some 20 million people are currently displaced in his country due to climate change conditions, and while attempts are being made to *relocate* these people, the country is faced with major problems in terms of *health, housing* and other support. Other delegates offered comments on similar situations and challenges in their countries

The discussion then focused on adaptation and mitigation strategies in the context of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and Disaster Risk Reduction Strategies (DRRs), as well as external resettlement. One delegate referred to cooperation agreements with neighbouring countries allowing affected migrants to relocate in his country and others stressed the need for more such bilateral and regional agreements. Small island states again referenced their particular situation where within-country relocation is often not an option, and concerned delegates referred to the need to develop further *international resettlement programs*, including temporary programs already in place in certain countries. Participants called for continued efforts to integrate climate-induced migration into National Adaptation Programmes and Disaster Risk Reduction Strategies.

In terms of policy challenges, participants recognized the need to develop mechanisms to *share information, best practices and lessons learned, define more clearly coherent policy options and promote regional and international cooperation*. Some also stressed the need to develop a common *terminology* concerning persons affected by climate change.

Given the multi-sectoral dimension of the issue, policy responses should generally relate to *environmental, migration, developmental and humanitarian* considerations. *Coherent and coordinated action* in all these areas is critical to adequately address the impact of climate change on migration and forced displacement. In addition, policy responses should not only involve governments but also *civil society, including diaspora organizations and the private sector*. Several participants also reiterated that there are limits to the effectiveness of mitigation and that migration and mobility are needed as a solution to environmental change. Political will was generally seen as essential if adequate measures were to be put in place to address the issue.

Concerning *terminology*, terms such as 'climate refugees' or 'environmental refugees' were not considered appropriate because of legal implications, while terms such as 'environmental migrants' or 'environmental displacees' appeared to be more appropriate.

Many participants also called for urgent action, including immediate assistance by the international community and the need to create appropriate *frameworks for such action,* including the idea of defining *'Guiding Principles'* for governments and other actors. International cooperation was seen as key, and many participants referred to the negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), where the issue of climate change, migration and development should be addressed more directly. Others suggested creating more specialized multi-stakeholder fora in which both governments and experts should be involved, including fora that should be set up by the GFMD to pursue the discussions of Puerto Vallarta.

Outcomes and recommendations

1. Expedite data and analysis exchange and sharing of first experiences and best practices, and for this purpose create a Virtual Library that would become a global public good on the available and soon-to-be-available data and analyses on the topic.

2. Strengthen the dialogue at the local, regional and global levels on the interconnections of climate change, migration and development, including exchanges on best practices and critical first experiences of policy intervention that might not be finalized or definitive but might point the way forward for urgent action. Encourage the GFMD to contribute to such dialogue in the future.

3. Recognize the need for all concerned stakeholders to begin discussions on an appropriate legal and institutional framework to address these important issues, including in the context of the UNFCCC.

RT Session 3.3: How can RCPs and Inter-regional Fora best include the migration and developn.ent nexus?

(Co-chairs: Indonesia, Morocco and Spain)

This session pursued the exchange on Regional Consultative Processes and Inter-regional Fora to review activities and progress made by such processes in linking migration and development issues more productively. Participants welcomed this further opportunity to address these issues in the GFMD context. This year, the discussion focused in particular on ways and means to include the migration and development nexus in the agendas of relevant RCPs and IRFs, with emphasis on promoting policy and institutional coherence in RCPs and IRFs; data and knowledge tools needed to define development-related considerations in RCPs; cross-fertilization among RCPs and IRFs; feedback and interaction between RCPs/IRFs and the GFMD; and the creation of RCPs in regions not yet covered.

A special report was presented on the work of the Ibero-American Forum on Migration and Development and its efforts to advance issues related to international migration and their connection to development and human rights. The report

highlighted the work of the Ibero-American Forum in advancing the human rights of migrants and the global migration governance agenda.

Main observations and findings

The Roundtable addressed the five questions highlighted in the session background paper, as follows:

The first question asked how a *whole-of-government* approach to migration management can be achieved, what kinds of *capacities, institutional mechanisms* and *coordination and communication strategies are* needed at the level of individual governments to effectively participate in RCPs and IRFs, and what kinds of capacities and mechanisms are required to promote a better understanding of the migration and development nexus and its inclusion in RCP agendas.

One delegate highlighted the importance of *national-level leadership* in effectively addressing migration issues on a regional level. He noted the role of *intergovernmental coordination structures* in ensuring that all interested parts of a government are involved in policy formulation. Such coordination structures also help raise awareness among government officials of the cross-cutting nature of migration issues.

Another delegate called for stronger *binding agreements among RCP members*. The work of RCPs, he said, must go beyond statements and consultative processes. Other delegates, however, *noted the value of the non-binding nature of RCPs and IRFs*, referring to the 2009 Hansen report on RCPs presented in Bangkok in 2009 and made available to the November 2009 GFMD meeting in Athens (the report considered that the informal non-binding nature of RCPs is "a powerful means to promote exchanges of best practices and approaches"). In the ensuing discussion, participants agreed that each RCP and IRF should freely decide whether their deliberations and outcomes should be of a binding nature or not.

A number of participants said that the *participation* of a government in an RCP or IRF and the promotion of a *whole of government policy approach* are, in fact, mutually reinforcing. Each promotes the other. While participation in RCPs and IRFs is based on national policies, it contributes to addressing and resolving regional issues, and in turn enhances the capacity of governments to work towards greater policy and institutional coherence at home.

One delegate noted that the creation of jobs in countries of origin is a critical step in enhancing the social dimension of development and migration. Several participants then called for *strengthening the role of civil society in RCP and IRF discussions*, while another delegate warned that differing configurations of government participation in RCPs present policymakers with challenges to ensuring continuity in national participation in RCPs.

The second question related to the *knowledge, data and tools* (for example, Migration Profiles at regional and sub-regional levels) that RCPs and IRFs need most in order to make well-informed decisions on how to incorporate migration and development issues in their agendas, and the possible role of the GFMD in terms of supporting the development and dissemination of the needed knowledge and tools.

One of the co-chairs noted that migration is currently addressed nationally, but would benefit from a more regional and global approach. Such an approach requires

strengthening institutional capacity both within states and within regional fora. Several delegates noted the critical importance of promoting good data collection, including sex-disaggregated data, which can ensure the necessary gender perspective in global and regional migration discussions.

Some delegations also noted the value of *Migration Profiles* as a tool for providing a standard template for the collection of migration data and for facilitating an "evidence-based approach" to migration policy development. Others mentioned that the necessary and most effective data tools for RCPs and IRFs depend on the individual focus of each forum. RCPs can also contribute to coordinating data collection and avoiding duplication of efforts. One of the co-chairs mentioned, as an example, the EU-level Regulation on Statistics on Migration and International Protection which establishes common rules for data collection and thus facilitates easy data comparison among participating governments. A number of delegates also called for tailored and targeted information campaigns directed at domestic audiences on key migration issues.

The third question referred to the importance of *cross-fertilization* among and between RCPs and IRFs, for example in introducing migration and development-specific issues to their agendas, or in strengthening cooperation on migration and development between countries of origin, transit and destination.

Delegates considered that the greatest value of RCPs and IRFs was bringing together origin, transit and destination countries into a single forum and promoting frank discussion among regional and inter-regional groupings, which is extremely valuable when discussing sensitive issues. The 2009 meeting of RCP Chairs in Bangkok had recognized the necessity of sharing information between RCPs. One of the co-chairs also suggested that IRFs be invited to a next full meeting of RCP Chairs.

As regards cross fertilization among RCPs or between RCPs and the GFMD, a representative of an international organization noted that, given the relatively brief history of most RCPs and the GFMD, it may be premature to assess the impact of such cross-fertilization. Another delegate felt that cross-fertilization and information within the GFMD is more developed among RCPs and IRFs. Finally, several delegations noted the critical role of RCP/IRF Chairs in promoting cross fertilization and closer cooperation.

The fourth question related to how *feedback between RCPs and IRFs* and the *GFMD*, could be enhanced. For example, could a process be envisaged by which interested RCPs and IRFs take up a specific topic defined at a GFMD meeting and include it in their annual agendas, in addition to their own regional areas of focus?

Using the South American Conference on Migration, as a positive example of cross-fertilization between an RCP and the GFMD, one delegate noted that as long as RCPs or IRFs are non-binding, their impact will be limited. He also asserted that civil society input is crucial to effective cross-fertilization.

Several delegations disagreed again on the necessity of a binding process. Each RCP is independent and, therefore, the decision of how binding an RCP's outcomes should be is appropriately left to RCP members themselves to decide.

Another delegate noted that RCPs focus on specific regional issues and migration challenges, while the GFMD takes a more global approach. As such, it may be

premature to institutionalize the linkages between the Forum and individual RCPs. A third delegate noted the specific modalities and dynamics of different RCPs, which can create obstacles to greater formal linkages with the GFMD. Nevertheless, it may be time to consider better structures and better follow-up that could eventually facilitate more structured linkages. The Common Space inaugurated at this GFMD meeting may be a model to be considered for such inter-action.

The fifth question asked what actions may be necessary to support countries *not currently members of any RCP* in joining such a process, or to *facilitate the creation of new RCPs* to address the migration issues of concern to them. Also, could the GFMD support such action?

One delegate highlighted the role of IOM as the organization best placed to fuel interest in creating RCPs in regions where they do not yet exist. In response, however, a delegate of an international organization said that while, in principle, it is desirable to fill the gaps between existing RCPs, having an outside institution facilitate the creation of an RCP often results in that RCP becoming overly dependent on that institution. *The process of creating an RCP is better and more effective if it is self-initiating.* For an RCP to be sustainable, others agreed, there must be both political will and ownership of the process by its individual members.

Finally, one country delegate reminded participants that there may be *good reasons for the absence of an RCP in a particular region.* Migration issues in that region may be too sensitive or too divisive. In the end, in the absence of political will among prospective members of a new RCP, it was also not clear what steps the GFMD could reasonably take to promote the creation of an RCP.

Outcomes and recommendations

1. National leadership in effectively addressing migration issues at a regional level is essential. Participation of governments in RCPs and IRFs also promotes and contributes to greater policy and institutional coherence at the national level; participation in RCPs and IRFs and a *whole-of-government* approach are thus mutually reinforcing.
2. Each RCP and IRF should freely decide whether its deliberations and outcomes should be of a binding nature or not.
3. Effective data collection at the regional and inter-regional level, including Migration Profiles and sex-disaggregated data to ensure the necessary gender perspective, should be promoted. Information sharing and cross-fertilization among RCPs and IRFs should be strengthened.
4. While it may be premature to institutionalize the linkages between the GFMD and RCPs and IRFs, the Common Space inaugurated at the Mexico GFMD meeting may be a model for such an interface.
5. The creation of RCPs should be at the initiative of interested governments, to ensure appropriate ownership.

6.4. WORKING SESSION ON THE PLATFORM FOR PARTNERSHIPS

(PfP)(Moderator: Mr. Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie; PfP Administrator: Ms. Wies Maria Maas)[29]

Over 100 delegates representing governments, international organizations and civil society attended the first working session of the GFMD *Platform for Partnerships* (PfP). The Moderator and the PfP Administrator explained that the PfP is an innovative mechanism launched by the Mexican GFMD Chair, in cooperation with the Swiss Government, to foster practical and action-oriented partnerships and cooperation among governments and other GFMD actors, particularly in implementing recommendations of GFMD meetings. The PfP has a virtual component facilitating and showcasing partnerships via a suitably structured web-based platform.

The PfP is envisaged to bring value added to the GFMD process by supporting projects that relate to outcomes of the GFMD, current GFMD Roundtable themes and *ad hoc* Working Group priorities. The following points about the nature of the PfP were underscored:

- Governments participating in the GFMD are the principal proposers, owners, and implementers of projects on the Platform; the PfP itself is a facilitator, not an implementer or funder of projects.
- The PfP is a flexible tool with online and offline components that can assist governments in forming or implementing partnerships at any stage of the project life cycle: initiation, design, implementation, or completion/follow-up.
- The *on-line* PfP can serve to collect ideas, information on projects, and comments/questions and to disseminate these to all users, while the off-line component can facilitate in establishing contacts and arranging face-to-face interactions among actual or potential partners.

During the general discussion, many delegates welcomed the PfP initiative and appreciated its concrete objectives. Some delegates sought to clarify what are the options for the projects, who would select them (whether a screening process would be put in place, how projects would be funded and how to guarantee the *sustainability, transparency, and fidelity to GFMD priorities of the PfP).* Other delegates expressed their desire to have many projects added to the PfP while coordinating with existing projects and avoiding duplication of effort. Some suggestions were also made, such as involving *non-governmental actors* in the development of PfP-projects and exploring possible synergies with the EC-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI) that has an existing community of practice of 1600 members.

In response to concerns raised, it was stressed that the GFMD Support Unit which administers the PfP does not select projects, nor does it directly take part in the implementation of PfP projects. *Project selection will be channelled through existing GFMD structures such as the ad hoc Working Groups, the Steering Group and the Chair-in-office.* In addition, the PfP will not provide funding for projects, which should be the primary responsibility of the states concerned. But the PfP

[29] The report was made possible thanks to the note taker to the PfP Working Session, Dr. Kathleen Newland, Migration Policy Institute.

could assist in seeking cooperation with other states or non-governmental stakeholders for this purpose.

The session also discussed the *three kick-off projects to launch the PfP: Engaging Diaspora in Development Activities; Protecting Unaccompanied Migrant Children and Developing Migration Profiles*. The salient features of each project are provided below, followed by the highlights of the general discussions:

Project 1: Handbook on Engaging Diasporas in Development Activities in both Host and Home Countries

The proposal for a handbook on diaspora engagement for development activities goes back to the discussions of Roundtable 1.2 of the 2009 Athens GFMD, where it was concluded that *a reference guide for diaspora engagement was lacking*. The Handbook is intended to be a tool for governments of both origin and destination countries, as they seek to involve their diasporas more closely in development efforts. It will identify *promising and productive practices for diaspora engagement, as well as key constraints* and innovative ways in which governments, often in partnership with civil society, have overcome these constraints. The input for the Handbook will have to come from governments through survey questionnaires, interviews and a validation workshop. The project is supported by The Netherlands, Switzerland and Mexico and is being implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Migration Policy Institute (MPI).

Various participants expressed support and willingness to share information that could serve as inputs to the Handbook. Some examples were cited, including Chile's 10-year process of diaspora engagement, GTZ's wide experiences and guidelines on engaging diaspora and the various diaspora-related projects of the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). It was suggested to look not only at what is being done, but also at *what should be done*.

Project 2: Protecting Unaccompanied Migrant Children

This project is an initiative of the Government of Mexico to *better protect unaccompanied migrant children*. It relates to the GFMD 2010 Roundtable themes of human development, irregular migration and migration and family, and builds upon the 2008 Roundtable on the protection and empowerment of migrants. The National Migration Institute (INM) of Mexico, with technical support from UNICEF, UNHCR and IOM, has trained over 300 federal INM and other departments' agents as child protection officers. The training is a by-product of the *Inter-agency Task Force on protecting unaccompanied migrant children, which was specially established to address this issue*. The same training has also been provided to migration officers of several countries of the Regional Conference on Migration (Puebla Process): Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras and the Dominican Republic.

Through the PfP, Mexico would like to offer similar trainings to other states free of charge, except for the costs of transport and accommodation of the officers and staff who will receive the training. Mexico will shoulder the related costs of sending the facilitators. The PfP will also be used to post and share training materials and, hopefully, to develop a virtual "community of practice" of protection officers.

A number of delegates expressed immediate interest in this project. Some suggested broadening the *focus beyond migration officials to include the police, which is an*

important protection unit in any government. Delegates from the Southeast Asian and West African regions expressed high interest in the project, explaining that in both regions unaccompanied child migration is a serious problem, *and many countries lack legal or policy instruments to deal with the trafficking of children.* Several African delegates emphasized the need for *regional cooperation and to learn* from the Latin American example, notably the guidelines for the protection of migrant children, which were developed through the Puebla Process. Another delegate expressed the wish to collaborate with UNICEF in order to replicate the project in Southeast Asia.

Project 3: Developing Migration Profiles

The Migration Profiles (MP) project is sponsored by, and forms part of, the thematic agenda of the *ad hoc* Working Group on Policy Coherence, Data and Research. IOM will assist in implementing the MP project alongside other interested partners, such as the European Commission. The 2009 GFMD meeting recommended the development of migration profiles with the objectives of *facilitating regular reporting of migration data, identifying data gaps and capacity-building needs and promoting coherence through the formation of national technical working groups.* More than 70 "first generation" migration profiles have been completed to date by various agencies, with many more in process. They have evolved from a brief snapshot of migration situations to a more elaborate *government-led process that promotes data collection and policy coherence through the involvement of many stakeholders, including the civil society.*

The PfP will assist the MP project by showcasing and sharing the results and experiences of countries, establishing a global database of migration profiles and supporting efforts to hold (inter-)regional workshops, form technical working groups to refine MP-templates and provide guidance, and link home and host countries through twinning arrangements.

Some best practices on the development of Migration Profiles were shared: Moldova has developed an extended migration profile, which is being used as a tool for policy development; while Ghana has formed an interagency working group that led to the creation of its migration profile and, in the process, also to skills training, institutional strengthening and better cooperation between the government, academic institutions and civil society.

The discussion pointed out the *need to standardize the templates to some extent,* in order to generate comparable data across countries. To this end, it was suggested that the PfP could play a facilitative role in creating such a standardized template. It was also reported that the South American Conference on Migration (CSM) is helping to support and harmonize migration profiles. Furthermore, several delegates felt that profiles need to be *updated regularly* and civil society should be encouraged to participate in the migration profiles exercise. Some saw the need for *receiving countries to also create a migration profile*, so that migrants and their home governments can understand the receiving countries' requirements on migration.

In closing, the incoming Chair Switzerland expressed its delight and appreciation for the enthusiasm that the participants showed during the first working session of the Platform for Partnerships. This reflected the commitment of the governments to the GFMD process as a whole. As next GFMD Chair, Switzerland gave assurance

that the concerns raised about logistics, project selection and funding will be taken into account in the further development of the PfP.

6.5. SPECIAL SESSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE FORUM

The Special Session was co-chaired by the Mexican Chair-in-office and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Migration and Development.

The main purpose of the Special Session was to reach agreement on an appropriate framework for the assessment process of the GFMD, as well as the Terms of Reference for the Assessment Team. These were both endorsed in Puerto Vallarta.

Three main issues were addressed during this session:[30]

- Statements on the migration phenomena and attendant problems;
- Relevance of the GFMD process and elements of what should be assessed, with some considerations about the future of the Forum, and
- Methodology and procedures to be put in place for the assessment

Delegates welcomed the launch of the assessment process of the GFMD under the Mexican Chair and considered that the background paper, which had earlier been elaborated, consulted on, amended and strengthened, reflected the preliminary views that should guide the assessment, and provided a very good starting point for the work of the Assessment Team. Governments opined that the informal, *voluntary and state-led nature of the GFMD* should remain a key principle, and recognized that the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General plays an important role and provides continuity and an institutional memory of the GFMD.

On the *challenges of the GFMD*, participants stressed the lack of predictability in funding for the Forum, which represents a constant danger for its sustainability. The present budgetary limitations experienced by a number of governments have increased the GFMD's vulnerability. It has become imperative to review the funding mechanisms. The Special Representative of the Secretary General, Sir Peter Sutherland, suggested some possible approaches that could bring a measure of predictability, such as the presentation of a tentative budget at the point when a government declares its willingness to chair the Forum; and a pledging session during which governments could express their willingness to contribute funds. In general, participants agreed that more needs to be done to achieve more predictable and sustainable funding to ensure the continuity of the process.

In reference to the *impact of the GFMD*, participating delegates offered a variety of comments and opinions. Some felt that the Forum has produced concrete responses and solutions. Others considered it an ideal platform for governments and other stakeholders to discuss migration and development questions at the multilateral level, without the sensitivities sometimes observed in other fora. Most of the delegations agreed that the GFMD has been growing year by year and become one of the most important spaces for policy dialogue and understanding. In many cases, the outcomes have informed policy design and the development of new laws.

In this context, the Mexican Chair stated that the aim of the Assessment would be to demonstrate *what the Forum has achieved* and whether *it is only a process for*

[30] 27 countries made an intervention during this session.

exchanging experiences and good practices; or *should it have more influence on public policies*. States needed to reach consensus and understanding on certain fundamental principles that underline the connection between migration and development. The assessment would be a snapshot of the Forum, so *that participating governments* can all proceed from the same starting point, when deciding what to do in the future. The Chair stressed the importance of following a step-by-step method directed at building transparency and credibility in the assessment, where all feel comfortable. This process needs to be handled carefully, in order to guarantee that it is open and inclusive.

Draft Terms of Reference for the Assessment Team were distributed and endorsed.

Governments agreed that the Chair and the Assessment Team will work on the definition and general lines to be assessed, as well as elements to be evaluated. After this initial step, the Chair and Assessment Team will begin their consultations about the way the GFMD operates, including how it prepares its meetings, its overall thematic focus and the choice of topics. It would look at its current structure, including the role of the Chair, the Steering Group, the Friends of the Forum, the Support Unit, the Working Groups, and its funding arrangements. It would also assess whether the Forum is conducive to productive dialogue and tangible, action-oriented outcomes in terms of substantive policy discussion, lessons learned and policy changes. And it would address the links and interaction with the United Nations, relevant international agencies and civil society stakeholders. All these and other relevant issues will be examined in an objective and comprehensive manner.

Participants also agreed that *the Assessment process* should look at possible options for the Forum's future. Some delegations expressed the need to be careful about *limiting the assessment only to the impact on policy*, and to also include actions taken in response to operational challenges posed by migration. One delegation suggested that the GFMD should serve as an operational body that ensures practical outcomes are actually implemented. Another considered it important to broaden the scope of the discussion, looking at what will happen beyond 2013 with the GFMD process, and the best format for discussing international migration and its links with development.

One delegation expressed the need to sharpen the focus of the Forum and perhaps reinvigorate the Working Groups and expand their membership. Others suggested that the development component should be reinforced within the GFMD discussions. Some governments expressed the need for a Forum that is inclusive and promotes a true partnership while establishing greater linkages with non-state actors in a structured manner, to allow them to make useful contributions.

The assessment process would be transparent, consensual and comprehensive, and should produce complete and thorough findings that would subsequently inform the analysis and debate, allowing states to decide on the course of action to take for the future of the Forum. The task should be completed in time for the High Level Dialogue in 2013. Governments stated that it is imperative for the assessment to reflect the specificities, challenges and aspirations of diverse countries and regions.

7. CLOSING PLENARY – NOVEMBER 11 (17.30-19.00)

The closing session began with the reports on the three Roundtables by: Mr. Manuel Imson, Labour Attache, The Philippines, for Roundtable 1; Mr. Azzouz Samri,

Plenipotentiary Minister, Morocco, for Roundtable 2 and Ambassador Maria Bassols, Chief of Cabinet of the Secretary General for Migration and Consular Affairs, Spain, for Roundtable 3. The salient points of their statements are reflected in the respective reports on the Roundtables.

Thereafter, Mr. Peter Sutherland, UN-Secretary General's Special Representative for International Migration and Development, highlighted the success of the GFMD as a space to discuss migration issues that has gathered more than 150 countries. He then reported on the highlights of the Special Session on the Future of the Forum. After four years, he observed the unanimous and strong sentiment that has been expressed in favour of the Forum, including those countries that were once sceptical about the process. He believed that the governments have established an effective, though fragile, process for overseeing the governance of the Forum. But he underlined the challenges the GFMD has to face ahead -while its aim is to drive effective policies and programs and to improve coherence between governments, the next step is two-fold: to systematically take stock of its impact and to continue strengthening its structure, so that it can be adapted and will become more efficient.

Mr. Sutherland also pointed out the need to confirm the considerable value of the GFMD as an international gathering. He was hopeful that the GFMD Assessment exercise will prove so, while the GFMD maintains its informal, voluntary and states-led nature, and further develop its connection, with the United Nations. He also remarked that a number of governments have steadfastly given financial support to the process. He urged governments to explore ways to ensure that the ideas developed by the GFMD are disseminated throughout the UN system. On this note, he pointed to another positive evolution which is the stronger relation between the GFMD and the Global Migration Group (GMG). He reiterated the Secretary General's continued involvement in the process. He then closed by thanking the Bancomer Foundation for the organization of the Civil Society Days.

The incoming 2011 GFMD Chair, H.E. Mr. Eduard Gnesa, Special Ambassador for International Collaboration on Migrations Issues, Switzerland, expressed his satisfaction for a very stimulating session in Puerto Vallarta. He was grateful to the Mexican Government for organizing and chairing the Fourth GFMD in such an enriching manner that kept the spirit of the GFMD very much alive. He encouraged all Member States to work on changing the public perceptions of migration, which should be considered as an opportunity and very positive phenomenon. Links between migration and development have to be further analyzed, and migration policies should be implemented in ways that will allow migrants to become economic and social development actors, so that they can benefit themselves and their home and host countries. Migration represents challenges and risks, and states have a great role to play in addressing these issues.

He assured to all of the Friends of the Forum that the GFMD and its achievements are very dear to Switzerland. They will take up the GFMD Chairmanship with utmost dedication and put emphasis on how to make GFMD a more action-oriented process. The lack of material time will not allow an international conference to be held in 2011. Nonetheless, Switzerland intends to carry on and further develop the initiatives that have been done in the past four years to continue encouraging interaction and cooperation, in particular through the two GFMD ad hoc Working Groups and the Platform for Partnerships. He called upon Member States to join efforts and make it a year dedicated to action.

The Swiss delegation greatly appreciated the valuable suggestions and ideas given by many Friends of the Forum in Puerto Vallarta on how to make the 2011 GFMD a year dedicated to a focused and action-oriented dialogue and how to ensure an ongoing exchange between governments and civil society Switzerland will attach equal importance to the initiation and supervision of the upcoming Global Forum assessment, for which they will rely on the valuable preparatory role that has been done by Mexico. Being aware of the importance of this exercise, Switzerland is committed to ensuring a maximum transparency while keeping in mind its true purpose: to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the Global Forum and identify concrete ways to improve it. The assessment should ultimately give the GFMD participating governments an objective and comprehensive basis for open and transparent deliberations about the future of the Forum.

Ambassador Gnesa was optimistic that the 5th session of the GFMD in 2011 will be intensive and inspiring. He called upon Member States to join efforts and make it a year dedicated to action.

In his closing remarks, the 2010 GFMD Chair, Julián Ventura Valero, expressed his appreciation to all the delegates for their active participation and cooperation in holding substantial, open and sincere debates. The 2010 GFMD was a good opportunity for states to exchange experiences on how to tackle the challenges posed by the migration phenomenon and the ways by which opportunities can be optimised to strengthen the link between migration and human development. Migration is part of the social and economic global reality. It is thus necessary to recognize the contributions of migrants and change the perceptions of migration.

The results of both the Government Meeting and the Civil Society Days were highly satisfying, resulting in practical insights and a sphere of consensus that will hopefully enrich the global deliberations on migration and development. Mexico promoted inclusion and transparency and engaged all stakeholders in developing the conceptual framework of the debates on *Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity - shared responsibility*. At the same time, new bridges of communication and cooperation were established between governments and the Civil Society using innovative mechanisms, such as the Common Space and the Platform for Partnerships (PfP). Mexico also laid the groundwork for the GFMD assessment exercise in order to prepare for the High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2013.

Ambassador Julián Ventura recognized the achievements of the two GFMD *ad hoc Working Groups* (one on protection and empowerment of migrants, and the other on policy coherence, data and research), the work done by the GFMD international advisers (Dr. Jorge Durand, Dr. Rolph Jenny, Dr. Irena Omelaniuk, Mr. Albert Moses, Mr. Chukwu Emeka-Chikezie) and the Mexican GFMD Taskforce, headed by the SRE and INM, the work of Estrella Lajom-Roman, Head of the GFMD Support Unit and her team, as well as the assistance given by the International Organization for Migration, Mr. Peter Sutherland and Mr. François Fouinat. He also thanked the Bancomer Foundation for their outstanding role organizing the Civil Society Days and all the governments and international organizations who gave financial support that allowed the attendance of delegates from over 131 countries, and the authorities of the State of Jalisco and the city of Puerto Vallarta. Finally, he thanked all delegates present who made the 2010 GFMD a highly satisfying session.

He expressed his confidence in the future of the Forum and wished all the delegates a happy return to their respective countries.

8. CLOSING REFLECTIONS

It is four years since the Global Forum on Migration and Development commenced its work, and on the eve of initiating an important assessment, this process is still being strengthened and reasserting itself as the most committed space to address the multidimensional aspects of the international migration phenomenon and its links with development.

Since the Forum's first meeting, Mexico has tried to contribute its vision and experience to enhance this process. Accepting the Chairmanship of the 2010 meeting represented a challenge but also a great opportunity to advance the debate on some outstanding issues that were on the Forum's agenda, with the intention of transcending stereotyped conceptions, and with a view to building a comprehensive and balanced vision of migration and development.

The year in which we chaired this process has been one of the most complicated for millions of migrants who, in their already difficult circumstances, have had to confront the effects of the economic crisis. This has left many people no other option than to return home as a consequence of unemployment and the downturn of productive sectors, and has slowed the growth in remittance flows, directly affecting the income of the migrants' families and negatively affecting the social perception of migrants, who are seen as unfair competition in the labour market and a burden on the social security systems in the host countries.

Taking into consideration the international context, the remarks contained in the concept paper on the central theme, *Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity-shared responsibility*, highlighted the importance of the cooperation of all stakeholders to meet the challenges, which the link between migration and development poses for countries of origin, transit and destination. The Theme Concept Paper stresses the centrality of assuring the protection of migrants' rights, regardless of their migration situation, and acknowledges their contribution as primary elements, which can facilitate their acceptance and inclusion in countries of destination, thereby reducing their vulnerability.

Since the drafting of the working papers for the debates in Puerto Vallarta, countries have expressed their interest and commitment in making the Forum a useful tool to develop initiatives and projects, and an important reference in the planning of public policy.

The 2010 GFMD was able to re-evaluate different important concepts and place them on its agenda. This made it possible to look at issues that had to be discussed in all their dimensions from a comprehensive and human perspective, and with the possibility of discussing them in greater depth in future meetings. The recommendations of the Roundtable sessions confirmed the relevance of continuing to debate these issues, while discussing ways to strengthen essential tools for decision-making and planning specific actions such as information exchanges, the creation of models and impact indicators.

Consistent with the central theme, we promoted the creation of new forms of communication with civil society and with international organizations, convinced that their experience was, among other things, a way of enriching the debates and

helping to implement the Forum's recommendations. The creation of the Common Space has shown that it is possible to have a respectful and constructive exchange of opinions, views and perspectives, and that the will exists to strengthen efforts in different tasks that migration and development demand.

Additionally, the Platform for Partnerships, a mechanism for developing specific projects that support the implementation of recommendations of previous Fora, is a firm step on the long but necessary path towards making the GFMD an action-oriented process.

The increasing interest in the work of the Forum demonstrates that it is a living process, and therefore we are sure that the results of its upcoming assessment will help shape further efforts towards long- term goals.

Recognizing that the Global Forum is a process under construction, Mexico will continue to contribute its vision and experience in order to consolidate it as the most appropriate space for multilateral discussion of the migration and development agenda.

The Mexican Government expresses its profound gratitude for the valuable support of all the states and other expert organizations that actively participated in, and supported the 2010 GFMD. It also reiterates its promise to remain open to dialogue and cooperation in order to find the answers to the challenges that migration and development pose.

9. SPECIAL THANKS

The Government of Mexico extends its gratitude to the many governments and other partners that have taken an active part in the preparation of the Roundtable Working Papers and sessions.

The Government of Mexico also expresses its appreciation for the support it received from the following countries and organizations, in the form of contributions, both financial and in-kind: Republic of Argentina, Commonwealth of Australia, Kingdom of Belgium, Canada, Kingdom of Denmark, French Republic, State of Israel, Italian Republic, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Kingdom of Norway, Republic of Portugal, Kingdom of Spain, Kingdom of Sweden, The Swiss Confederation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the MacArthur Foundation.

Appendix I

[Original: English]

Directory

Chair-in-Office	
NAME	Amb. Julián Ventura Valero
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Chair-in-Office Undersecretary for North America Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs
CONTACT INFO	Plaza Juárez 20, 18th floor, Col. Centro, Mexico City, 06010 T: +52 55 3686-5804 F: +52 55 3686-5605 Email Foreign Affairs : jventurav@sre.gob.mx

Executive Director[1]	
NAME	Dr. René Zenteno
FORMAL TITLE	Vice Minister for Population, Migration on Religious Affairs.
CONTACT INFO	Abraham González 48, Col. Juárez, Mexico City, 06600 T: + 52 55 5093-3985 / 88 F: + 52 55 5093-3683 Email : amtortes@segob.gob.mx

TASKFORCE

NAME	Mr. Rolando García Alonso
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Coordinator for International and Interinstitutional Relationship National Migration Institute (NMI)
CONTACT INFO	Homero 1832, 18th floor, Col. Los Morales Polanco, Mexico City, 11510 T: +52 55 5387-2400 ext. 18712 F: +52 55 5557-9860 Email NMI : rgalonso@inami.gob.mx

NAME	Min. Socorro Flores Liera
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD Mexican Focal Point GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Director General for Global Issues Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs
CONTACT INFO	Plaza Juárez 20, 14th floor, Col. Centro, Mexico City, 06010 T: +52 55 3686-5628/99 F: +52 55 3686-5632 Email Foreign Affairs : sflores@sre.gob.mx

[1] Mrs. Cecilia Romero Castillo, then Commissioner of NMI, acted as Executive Director. On 7 October, she was succeeded by Mr. Salvador Beltrán del Río Madrid.

NAME	Mrs. Norma Araceli Diaz Godinez
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Director for Migration Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs
CONTACT INFO	Plaza Juárez 20, 15th floor, Col. Centro, Mexico City, 06010 T: +52 55 3686-5769 F: +52 55 3686-5632 Email Foreign Affairs : ndiaz@sre.gob.mx

NAME	Mr. Hugo Rodriguez Nicolat
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Technical Secretary
CONTACT INFO	Homero 1832, 18th floor Col. Los Morales Polanco, Mexico City, 11510 T: +52 55 5387-2400 ext. 18712 F: +52 55 5557-9860 Personal Email: hugo.rodrigueznicolat@gmail.com

NAME	Mrs. Evelyn Vera Barreto
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Deputy Director for Migration Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs
CONTACT INFO	Plaza Juárez 20, 15th floor, Col. Centro, Mexico City, 06010 T: +52 55 3686-5100 ext. 7240 F: +52 55 3686-5632 Email Foreign Affairs : evera@sre.gob.mx

NAME	Mr. Angel Kuri Cervantes
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Deputy Director for Multilateral Affairs National Migration Institute
CONTACT INFO	T: +52 55 5387-2400 ext. 18109 F: +52 55 5557-9860 Email NMI : akuri@inami.gob.mx

NAME	Mrs. Claudia Bueno
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Adviser for the Undersecretary for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs
CONTACT INFO	T: +52 55 3686-5601 F: +52 55 3686-5632 Email Foreign Affairs : cbueno@sre.gob.mx

NAME	Mr. Alberto Quiroz
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Officer for the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs
CONTACT INFO	T: +52 55 3686-5100 ext. 5769 F: +52 55 3686-5632 Email Foreign Affairs : aquiroz@sre.gob.mx

NAME	Ms. Michelle Tejadilla Orozco
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Officer of the National Migration Institute
CONTACT INFO	T: +52 55 5387-2400 ext. 18258 F: +52 55 5557-9860 Email NMI : mtejadilla@inami.gob.mx

NAME	Mr. Salvador Berumen Sandoval
FORMAL TITLE	GFMD 2010 Taskforce Member Officer of the National Migration Institute
CONTACT INFO	T: +52 55 5387-2400 ext. 18327 F: +52 55 5557-9860 Email NMI : sberumen@inami.gob.mx

NAME	Mr. Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie
FORMAL TITLE	Special Adviser to the Chair-in-Office
CONTACT INFO	T Sierra Leone: +232 33 89 99 77 / +232 78 89 99 77 T U.K: +44 7847 400 001 Email : internationaladviser@gfmd.org Personal Email: cechikezie@gmail.com

NAME	Dr. Jorge Durand
FORMAL TITLE	Special Adviser to the Chair-in-Office
CONTACT INFO	T Mexico: +52 33 3819-3327 Email : internationaladviser@gfmd.org Personal Email: jdurand@princeton.edu

NAME	Dr. Rolph Kurt Jenny
FORMAL TITLE	Special Adviser to the Chair-in-Office
CONTACT INFO	P.O. Box 78, 1211 Ginebra 20, Suiza T: +41 79 433-2581 / +33 450 424-054 Email : internationaladviser@gfmd.org Personal Email: rkjenny@gcim.org

NAME	Min. Albert Moses
FORMAL TITLE	Special Adviser to the Chair-in-Office
CONTACT INFO	T: + 1 514 932 8076 M: +1 514 409 5654 Email : internationaladviser@gfmd.org Personal Email: acmosen@hotmail.com

NAME	Dr. Irena Omelaniuk
FORMAL TITLE	Special Adviser to the Chair-in-Office
CONTACT INFO	T USA: +1 703 5289346 M USA: +1 703 6089136 Email : internationaladviser@gfmd.org Personal Email: iomelaniuk@yahoo.com.au

PERMANENT MISSION OF MEXICO IN GENEVA

NAME	Amb. Juan José Gómez Camacho
FORMAL TITLE	Permanent Representative of Mexico to International Organizations in Geneva
CONTACT INFO	T: + 41 22 748 0707/21 F: + 41 22 748 0708 Email: mission.mexico@ties.itu.int Personal Email: jgomezc@sre.gob.mx

NAME	Amb. Arturo Hernández Basave
FORMAL TITLE	Alternate Permanent Representative of Mexico to International Organizations in Geneva
CONTACT INFO	T: + 41 22 748 0707/21 F: + 41 22 748 0708 Email: mission.mexico@ties.itu.int Personal Email: ahernandezb@sre.gob.mx

NAME	Mr. Miguel Malfavon
FORMAL TITLE	Counsellor
CONTACT INFO	T: + 41 22 748 0707/21 F: + 41 22 748 0708 Email: mission.mexico@ties.itu.int Personal Email: mmalfavon@delegamexoi.ch

GFMD SUPPORT UNIT

NAME	Mrs. Estrella Lajom Roman
FORMAL TITLE	Head, GFMD Support Unit
CONTACT INFO	T : + 41 22 788 49 46 or 47 F: + 41 22 788 4948 M : + 41 79 513 9323 Email : supportunit@gfmd.org Personal Email: estrellalajom@bluewin.ch

Appendix 2

[Original: English]

Global Forum on Migration and Development

Mexico 2010

Preliminary Draft Budget

Concept	Cost (in euros)	
	Subtotal	Total
Taskforce		**96,704**
Fees[i]	34,994.86	
Travel expenses[ii]	31,142.36	
Accommodation	30,566.53	
Preparatory activities (SG, FOF, others)		**25,953**
Equipment leasing	1,621.41	
Simultaneous Interpretation and Translation (three languages)	11,632.57	
Recording of the meetings	2,427.45	
Meals	10,271.62	
General Logistics		**1,542,348**
Convention Center	59,295.41	
Furniture and equipment leasing for the venue[iii]	669,282.36	
Meals	72,150.31	
Stationery, printing materials and final report	80,897.70	
Additional contribution to the Civil Society Days	91,336.12	
Financial assistance for participants from Least Developed Countries[iv]	423,442.25	
Operational expenses	145,944.28	
Contingency Fund (5%)	**5.0%**	**83,250**
FINAL COST		**1,748,255**
Contributions		
Mexican Government Contributions	**1,029,922.63**	
Expected Voluntary Contributions	**718,332.87**	

Based on the exchange rate of 19.16 mexican pesos/1 euro.

[i] This includes only the fees for some international experts who are part of the Taskforce within the Organizing Committee for 2010. All fees and wages for the Mexican officials involved in the Organizing Committee are excluded from this draft. Although the organization of the 2010 Forum represents an additional burden to their tasks and a reorganization of their priorities, it does not imply an additional expenditure for the Mexican government.

[ii] Estimates based on the average cost of round trip tickets according to IOM's preferential fees. These costs cover Taskforce attendance to all necessary Steering Group meetings, Friends of the Forum and other preparatory activities. Travel and accommodation costs of some international advisers are paid by their sponsors.

[iii] This cost includes leasing of furniture, audio equipment, simultaneous interpretation equipment (three languages) and other logistical necessities. It also includes a part of the contribution of the Mexican Government to the Civil Society Days (CSD) costs for these items. This estimate also covers the above referred costs for the organization.

[iv] Estimates based on the average number of delegates from the least developed countries and other low income countries listed on the DAC list that have previously required some financial assistance. It also includes panelists from such countries. Estimates include transportation, per diem and accommodation.

Appendix 3

[Original: English]

Final expenditures[1]

Particulars	USD
Preparatory Meetings in Geneva	$36,219.00
Advisory Services	$201,164.00
Travel costs of Advisors	$63,401.00
Convention Center and equipment	$262,966.80
Costs related to Puerto Vallarta Meeting	$570,508.06
Translation and interpretation services	$99,627.00
Catering	$289,680.51
Travel and participation costs of developing countries	$512,677.00
Ground transportation	$46,292.07
Report of the Proceedings printing	$8,668.62
Staff and organizational services	$266,067.56
Direct contribution to the CSD	$120,000.00
Other expenditures	$49,377.71
Total Expenditure	**$2,526,649.32**
International Contributions	**$1,084,490.00**
Mexican Contribution	**$1,442,159.32**

[1] This report considers the costs covered by the Mexican contribution and the international contributions, but does not include in-kind contributions, such as some of the international advisers fees; commissioned studies to support the Roundtables; venues for the preparatory meetings in Geneva and some operational expenses kindly covered by the local government of Jalisco. For further details, please consult the following pages.

Mexican Contribution

Expenditure Details

Particulars	Subtotal USD	Total USD
Convention Center and equipment		**$262,966.80**
Convention Center	$91,265.73	
Convention Center equipment	$171,701.07	
Costs related to Puerto Vallarta Meeting		**$570,508.06**
Registration	$18,974.65	
Welcome stands	$24,420.48	
Welcome kit	$30,176.44	
Conference officers	$34,645.60	
Audiovisual systems, lighting and other equipment	$462,290.88	
Ground transportation[2]		**$29,820.07**
Catering		**$289,680.51**
Catering	$254,211.39	
Coffee breaks	$35,469.12	
Report of the Proceedings printing		**$8,668.62**
Staff and organizational services		**$266,067.56**
Miscellaneous		**$14,447.71**
Total Expenditure covered by Mexican Contribution		**$1,442,159.32**

[2] National budget covered 65% of ground transportation expenditure.

International Contributions

Expenditure Details

Particulars	Subtotal USD	Total USD
Preparatory Meetings in Geneva		**$36,219.00**
Advisory Services		**$201,164.00**
Dr. Jorge Durand Advisory Services	$20,000.00	
Dr. Rolph Jenny Advisory Services	$145,164.00	
Mr. Francois Fouinat Advisory Services	$36,000.00	
Travel costs of Advisors		**$63,401.00**
Ground transportation[3]		**$16,472.00**
Translation and interpretation services		**$99,627.00**
Translation	$29,788.00	
Simultaneous interpretation	$69,839.00	
Travel and participation costs of developing countries[4]		**$512,677.00**
Contribution to the CSD		**$120,000.00**
Research		**$1,000.00**
Platform for Partnerships		**$33,930.00**
Total Expenditure covered by International Contributions		**$1,084,490.00**

[3] International contributions covered 35% of ground transportation expenditure.

[4] These services were provided by IOM under the conditions established in the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Mexican GFMD Chair in August 2010.

Appendix 4

[Original: English]

International contributions to the fourth Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development

Donors	Amount	Purpose
Financial		
Chair in Office (Mexico)	**MXN 17'368,550.40**	Hosts of the Fourth Meeting of the GFMD in Puerto Vallarta
Countries		
Argentina	USD 1,000	For research
Australia	AUD 28,522.50	For International Advisor
Belgium	Euro 35,000	For participants from BDCA Member States
Canada	USD 25,000	For organizational expenses
Denmark	Euro 98,866.71	For participants from developing countries
France	Euro 25,000	For organizational expenses
Israel	USD 4,970	For translation costs
Italy	Euro 15,000	For participants from developing countries
MacArthur Foundation	USD 136,000	For travel for participants / International Advisor
Netherlands	Euro 200,000	Unearmarked
Norway	Euro 104,448.50	For participants from developing countries
Portugal	Euro 20,000	For participants from developing countries
Spain	Euro 100,000	Unearmarked
Sweden	Euro 74,220.30	For participants from developing countries
Switzerland	CHF 202,000	For organizational expenses / International Advisor
UK	GBP 25,000	For participants from developing countries
United States of America	USD 50,000	For participants from developing countries
Non-Financial		
Countries		
Netherlands		Secondment, International Advisor
United Arab Emirates		For research studies that supported RT preparations

Others	
IOM	Secondment, International Advisor, also technical and logistics assistance
UNICEF	Secondment, International Advisor and technical assistance
ILO, UNOG	Provision of venues of preparatory meetings held in Geneva, free of charge

Appendix 5

[Original: English]

Co-chairs and Government teams for round table sessions

ROUNDTABLE SESSION	"PARTNERSHIPS FOR MIGRATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: SHARED PROSPERITY, SHARED RESPONSIBILITY"			
CO-CHAIRS	GOVERNMENT TEAM MEMBERS			INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
RT 1.1	***Partnerships for more regular and protected migration***			
France	Australia	Germany	Nigeria	IOM
Brazil	Bangladesh	Israel	USA	OECD
	Belgium	Mauritus	Portugal	
	Canada	Mexico		
RT 1.2	***Joint Strategies to Address Irregular Migration***			
Ecuador	Argentina	Mexico	Philippines	IOM
Netherlands	Azerbaijan	Morocco	Republic of Moldova	
	Greece	Niger		
	Italy	Nigeria		
RT 2.1	***Reducing the cost of migration and maximizing human development***			
Sweden	Bangladesh	Greece	Morocco	EU Delegation
UAE	Chile	Kenya	Republic of Moldova	IOM
Sri Lanka	Ecuador	Japan	South Africa	ILO
	Ethiopia	Mauritus	Spain	WHO
	Germany	Mexico		
RT 2.2	***Migration, gender and family***			
Mexico	Armenia	Israel	Sudan	IFAD
	Chile	Philippines	Ukraine	UNIFEM
	Ecuador	Portugal	UK	UNICEF
	Greece	Spain		IOM
				ILO
				WHO
RT 3.1	***Assessing the impact of migration on the economic and social development and addressing its cause-effect relationship***			
Argentina	Colombia	Mexico	Sudan	EU Delegation
Kenya	France	Morocco		IFAD
Switzerland	Mauritus	Republic of Moldova		IOM
RT 3.2	***Assessing the relevance and impact of climate change on migration an ! development***			
Bangladesh	Chile	Germany	Mexico	IOM
UK	Ecuador	Ghana	Switzerland	
	France	Mauritus		

RT 3.3	***How can regional consultative properties and interregional forums best incorporate the migration and development nexus in their agendas?***			
Indonesia	Australia	Mexico	Thailand	IOM
Morocco	Bangladesh	Niger	USA	
Spain	Ecuador	Republic of Moldova		

Appendix 6

[Original: English]

Presented orally and in writing on 10 November 2010 to the opening Plenary of States, Civil Society and Observers, Global Forum on Migration and Development 2010, by John K. Bingham, Chair of the CSD Steering Committee

Statement of the Civil Society Days
Global Forum on Migration and Development
Puerto Vallarta, Mexico
8-9 November 2010

More than 400 delegates and observers from 80 countries, representing migrants and a wide range of other civil society actors, international organizations and 33 governments, met during the Civil Society Days of the Global Forum on Migration and Development in Puerto Vallarta to consider the theme of this year's meeting–"Partnerships for Migration and Human Development: Shared Prosperity, Shared Responsibility." We were honoured by the presence of H.E. Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico and the active participation of the first lady, Sra. Margarita Zavala.

We acknowledge that clear progress has been made on better integrating civil society in the debate with governments, and congratulate the host government Mexico and the organizing team at Bancomer Foundation. We hope that this greater engagement between civil society and government will lead to practical outcomes.

As we meet for the fourth time, we reiterate that while voluntary migration can contribute in important ways to development, migration is not and cannot be used as a substitute for development. Our deliberations took place as the global economic crisis continues to threaten the economic well-being of millions, climate change poses the potential for large scale displacement within countries and across international borders, and criminalization of migrants, militarization of borders and attacks against immigrants, most particularly the massacre of 72 Central and South Americans in Tamaulipas, threaten the human and physical security of migrants. Civil society decries rising xenophobia that scapegoats migrants for broader societal and economic problems that are not of their making. The perception of migrants, in countries of origin, transit and destination needs to change radically. Against this backdrop, particular emphasis was given to the importance of greatly increasing efforts, partnerships and mechanisms to ensure protection of the human rights of migrants worldwide.

Human development

We welcome the GFMD chair's focus on human development. We emphasize that the right to development is a basic human right, it is far more than economic growth. It is a holistic principle that guarantees the social, economic and cultural rights of all, including migrants; it must include opportunities for human growth, access to decent work at

home and abroad, health care, education, security of life and person, and full participation in political and social processes. In short, there can be no real development without human rights.

We urge governments to move migration out of the national security agenda and towards the framework of human rights, human development and human security. We also call on governments to assess the impact of trade policies, agricultural subsidies, and unsustainable development programs that displace large number of people from their homes and livelihoods.

Remittances are an important but not exclusive means by which migrants contribute to human development. Remittances must not be used as replacement of government responsibility to finance and allocate resources for development. Governments should recognize the potential pitfalls – the perpetuation of the culture of dependency and overreliance of governments on remittances.

We often hear "migration should be by choice, not necessity," but what does this phrase mean? Essentially, it is creating jobs at home that provide adequate income and decent work conditions and public services, such as health and education, which ensure people's well-being. While governments have primary responsibility for sustainable development, they should work with civil society to create public policies that alleviate the need to migrate in search of better opportunities. They should also support the initiatives of the many federations and migrant clubs and associations in destination countries that send money back to the origin countries to create jobs, support public services and generate development.

Labour migration

We urge governments to eliminate the degradation of fundamental human rights based on forms of migration, in particular between highly-skilled and mid and low-skilled workers, between temporary and permanent migrants, and between regular and irregular migrants. Visa systems should be reformed to eliminate discrimination in status between so-called "high skilled" and "low skilled" workers with respect to portability of employment permits, family unity and possibilities of permanent settlement. We note as well the problematic use of gender, race and ethnic differences to differentiate and divide labour.

Civil society calls upon governments to organize evidence-based discussions of temporary and circular migration. Civil society considers that the GFMD tends to turn a blind eye to the many pitfalls of temporary labour migration programmes and overestimates their advantages.

We recommend steps to protect the rights of migrant workers, including strict regulation of recruitment agencies, no shifting of recruitment fees directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, to migrants, lowering other costs of migration, ending visas tied to specific employers (i.e., sponsorship systems, especially for low-skilled workers in sectors of conspicuous vulnerability and abuse), protecting migrant earnings, facilitating remittance transfers, freedom of association, and providing portability of pension and other social security benefits related to employment. We call, in particular, for the adoption, ratification and implementation of the ILO domestic worker's convention to ensure greater protection of this particularly vulnerable population.

Enforcement of worker rights must be de-linked from immigration enforcement policies. Access to justice is fundamental to maximizing the benefits of labour migration for workers. For example, migrant workers should have access to social security benefits, health care, and legal remedies and mechanisms for enforcing rights. Migrant workers should have access to information about their rights and conditions of work in countries of destination.

Redefining and reducing "irregular migration"

Delegates pointed to hypocrisy in government policies to control irregular migration. Effectively, governments say "We need you but we do not want you." Irregular migrants make contributions to society and the economy but get little in return—for example, they are not eligible for social benefits or pensions despite often contributing in tax payments. Further, by not addressing the root causes of migration, governments are contributing to further irregular migration.

Civil society supports the enactment of specific mechanisms for regularization of the status of irregular migrants to address these contradictions. We caution governments that they should not use the term 'illegal immigrant' because everyone has inherent human rights. We support regular and safe migration channels for low-wage workers, domestic workers, etc.

We deplore the growing criminalization of irregular migrants, the heavy emphasis on security, enforcement, militarization, detention, border controls and deportation. Criminalization is a serious obstacle for undocumented migrants in their protection from violence, access of essential public services (for example, health care and education), support services, and access to justice and redress. We urge governments to explore alternatives to detention that not only are more humane but cost less as well. Children should not be detained under any circumstance.

Human Security and Protection of the Human Rights of Migrants

Children and youth, particularly those unaccompanied in their journeys, must be given appropriate care and protection, in accordance with the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Partnerships amongst all stakeholders including government, civil society groups (including migrant associations, trade unions, and human rights organizations) and employers are essential to the promotion of migrant rights, particularly labour rights.

In the context of the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, we urge governments to ratify and implement this important instrument as well as the other core human rights conventions. States that have ratified these conventions should take steps to incorporate them into national legislation and practices.

Families

There needs to be recognition of the social cost of migration, especially for women and families, because of abandonment, alienation of children and difficulty of maintaining family ties while recognizing that migration also has benefits for families. Lack of policy regarding families and too much focus on the individual worker and not their family impede efforts to protect the families left behind by migration. Within this framework, the rights of families (to reunification for example) must be included.

Indicators need to be developed to measure the cost and benefits of migration for families. Mechanisms need to be set up at the local, national and international level for family reunification. More specifically, we urge governments to ease access to visas to allow visitation with family in destination country, create transnational mechanisms to facilitate legal process in the destination country for alimony and child support for families left behind, to ensure that they are receiving some money to maintain the household, implement a database system to identify disappeared migrants, with access by either NGO/consulates to be able to help families track down their relatives, and set up technological systems to allow communication between families.

Gender sensitive migration policies: Women's agency and development

Civil society gave particular attention to gender issues, focusing specifically on the situation of migrant women and women staying behind. We underscore that women are not primarily victims, but bearers of rights and active agents in claiming their rights and contributing to development. Migrant women need to be independent in terms of documents, work permits, mobility and control over income. Women's economic, social

and cultural rights must be ensured, including the right to decent work. We call on governments to develop gender-sensitive monitoring indicators on migration policies, including indicators to measure progress of CEDAW's General Recommendation #26 for women and girl migrants. Governments should recognize and address the adverse effects of current migration policies on women and acknowledge the different needs of women in different regions and circumstances.

We decry violence against women migrants, including trafficking. We call upon governments to implement policies to eliminate violence against women, that they protect migrant women's human rights at every stage of the migration process, irrespective of women's origin, sexual orientation and other grounds of discrimination. Gender-based persecution needs to be considered as grounds for refugee status under the Refugee Convention.

Migrant empowerment

The voice of migrants must be heard in public policy debates, especially regarding migration policies and development policies of their home and destination communities. We must ensure that community-based migrant organizations and youth organizations are allowed to fully participate in processes such as the GFMD.

We support migrant empowerment so they are better able to defend their human and labour rights and combat exploitation and abuses in both countries of origin and destination. We urge governments, foundations and other donors to increase the resources available for capacity building of migrant organizations, focusing on such areas as financial literacy, development of organizational skills, advocacy and education, including small diaspora organizations and binational organizations that work in both countries of origin and destination.

Climate change

Climate change, in combination with other factors affecting people's livelihoods and security, holds potential to displace people in an unprecedented manner. Much of this migration will be internal or across borders into similarly vulnerable countries. Areas of concern include the absence of national and international policies, institutional systems, and rights-based normative rules to address large scale movements of people because of climate change. There is absence of research and in-depth studies on such migration. Moreover, there is lack of consensus on basic definitions—for example, whether those displaced by climate change should be considered migrants, displaced persons or refugees.

We call upon developed countries to provide technical and financial resources towards mitigation and adaptation strategies and support public services to help countries of the Global South address the impact of climate change. We call for further regulation of corporations to stop the reckless agricultural, deforestation and industrial practices that contribute to the destruction of land, water, forest and environment. Proactive policies must be evolved globally to address problems of island nations and delta regions that are under threat of inundation. Adaptation strategies should consider ways to help people remain at home when possible and ways to help people move in safety and dignity when they cannot stay in place. We call upon governments to involve migration experts and the diaspora in such strategies.

Regional and Inter-regional Consultative Processes

We call upon governments to include civil society in the regional and inter-regional consultative processes. Greater progress will be made in implementing recommendations from the RCPs if governments elevate the processes to formal, binding structures. We call on governments to ensure that a human rights approach is at the forefront of these processes.

Future of the Forum

Civil society recognizes significant steps that the GMFD has taken under Mexico's leadership this year. Civil society applauds several innovations by the Mexican government this year: bringing some 200 civil society delegates together with the entirety of states in the formal GFMD programme of the states; the formal connection of the CSD to the parallel People's Global Action on Migration, Development and Human Rights held the week before; the new focus on irregular migration, climate change, families and gender perspectives in migration; the survey of civil society conducted on the Future of the Forum; and the concrete case study approach that looked at migrant domestic workers and remittance maximization, among others. While progress has been made, we believe that engagement between civil society and governments is still too limited and we call upon governments to more fully bring civil society into their deliberations and work with civil society to ensure implementation of the recommendations coming out of the entire GFMD process. The Civil Society Days expressed concern as well about the ad hoc nature of the GFMD, whose future appears too dependent on the willingness of governments to volunteer to host the annual events.

Moving ahead, civil society urges specific and honest, evidence-based attention within GFMD processes to the following subjects:

1 The pitfalls of temporary and circular migration
2 Effective partnerships and serious measures to increase protection of migrants in transit
3 Rights-based labour migration policies
4 Reducing the necessity to migrate and the financial and social costs of migration
5 Greater integration of private sector actors and shared initiatives in migration and development

Finally, civil society looks forward to working with Switzerland to measure and deepen the impact of all these processes, not to reduce the importance of the GFMD but with a fresh look at thematic centered discussions, regional approaches and formal assessment, in collaboration with all stakeholders in that pursuit.

****

This statement and also a full report of the Civil Society Days conclusions and recommendations will be made available on the GFMD website.